

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 5197 00140945 0

An Historic Sketch of the
SECOND PRESBYTERIAL CHURCH
of
Charleston, S.C.
1838

SMC
285.1757
B72

SMC
85.1757
B72

Smyth Collection

Presbyterian College

Library

S m C

No. 285.1757

B72

a 8462

S m C

285.1757

B72

8462

Photomount
Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN 21, 1908

A HISTORIC SKETCH

OF THE

SECOND

OF CHARLESTON,

Presbyterian

Church,

OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

FROM ITS BEGINNING
TO THE PRESENT TIME.

BY

REV. GILBERT R. BRACKETT, D. D.,

PASTOR.

PUBLISHED IN YEAR BOOK, 1898.

LUCAS & RICHARDSON CO. PRINT
CHARLESTON, S. C.



AN HISTORIC SKETCH
OF THE
SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

FROM ITS BEGINNING TO THE PRESENT TIME,

BY

REV. GILBERT R. BRACKETT, D. D.,
PASTOR.

Presbyterians were among the first settlers in South Carolina. They have been proportionably numerous in all periods of its history, and during the latter part of the 18th century, the great majority of emigrants were Presbyterians. In the year 1704, when there was but one Episcopal congregation in the whole province, then numbering towards thousand white inhabitants, the dissenters had three churches in Charleston. As early, however, as the year 1703, the Presbyterians in conjunction with the Independents, formed a church in Charleston, which continued in united form for forty years. During this period, two of their ministers, the Rev. Messrs. Stobo and Livingston, Presbyterians, and connected with Charleston Presbytery. After the death of the latter, twelve families seceded, and formed a Presbyterian Church, on the model of the church of Scotland. Previous to 1790 the Presbytery was not incorporated, from reasons to be presently mentioned. It belonged to the churches of Wiltown, Pon-Pon, St. Thomas', Stoney Creek, Salt Catchers, Black Mingo, the original and first incorporated church of Williamsburg, Charleston, Edisto, and the church of John and Wadmalaw lands. In 1790, four of these, by a petition to the Legis-

lature, were constituted a body corporate, principally in view of raising a fund for the relief of widows and orphans of deceased ministers. In 1790, the Presbytery of Charleston made application to be received as a constituent part of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, but this union was never formed. The ministry constituting this Presbytery were mostly from Scotland and Ireland; "men," says Ramsay, "of good education, orderly in their conduct, and devoted to the systems of doctrine and government established in Scotland."

It may well be inquired, why, with such an early and continued prominence in the colony, Presbyterians did not multiply to a corresponding extent; recommended as they ever have been by an enlightened, educated and laborious ministry? To this, plain answer can be given by the statement of a few facts. In the year 1698, an Act was passed by the Government "to settle a maintenance on a minister of the Church of England in Charleston." The precedent, thus set by the Legislature, and without any suspicion acquiesced in by the people, was the germ of a future ecclesiastical establishment. Most of the proprietors and public officers of the province being attached to the Church of England, determined if possible to secure for it legal pre-eminence and connection with the State. The election of members of this church to the Legislature was covertly promoted, and a majority obtained. "The recently elected members," says Dr. Ramsay, "soon after they entered upon their legislative functions, took measures for perpetuating a power they had thus obtained, for they enacted a law 'which made it necessary for all persons thereafter chosen members of the Commons House of Assembly to conform to the religious worship of the Church of England, and receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites and usages of the Church.'" This Act passed the lower House by a majority of one vote. It virtually excluded from a seat in the Legislature all who were dissenters, erected an aristocracy, and gave a monopoly of power to

one sect, though far from being a majority of the inhabitants. Though the infant establishment of the Church of England, thus instituted, was frowned upon by the ruling powers in England, and was disagreeable to a majority of the inhabitants of Carolina, yet no further steps were then taken for restoring to dissenters their equal rights. The Episcopal party continued to maintain their ascendancy in the Assembly, and made legislative provision for extending and maintaining their mode of worship. In two years, the colony was divided into ten parishes, and each parish was made a corporation. Some of these were afterwards subdivided, and others occasionally formed as the population extended.

Money was provided by law for building and repairing churches; lands were secured by donation, purchase or grants from proprietors, at the public expense, for glebes and church yards; and salaries for the different rectors, clerks, and sextons of the established parishes were fixed and made payable out of the provincial treasury. Legislative acts were passed for the encouragement of Episcopal clergymen to settle in the province, and exercise their clerical functions, in the several parishes designated by law.

This state of things, with but little variation, continued for seventy years, and as long as the province remained subject to Great Britain. In the course of that period twenty-four parishes were laid off, most of which were in maritime districts, and none more than ninety miles from the seacoast.

It was not until the period of the Revolution, that this monopoly of religious privilege was broken up, and Presbyterians and other denominations of Christians, were restored to equality of rights, and freed from a taxation which required them to support an established faith, with which in many things they could not agree. Nor was this deliverance even then granted them but from necessity. For they had now an unquestionable majority in the colony, and the physical force necessary for war and defence was theirs. Without union among all parties, there was no pros-

pect of success, and therefore, after seventy years of exclusive authority, the Established Church was under the necessity of yielding to a constitution which gave equal laws, equal rights, and full and free toleration to all sects and parties. The unfettered progress of Presbyterians must be dated, therefore, from the period of repose after the storm of the Revolution, when they found their funds unguarded by every previous security, almost entirely gone, and their prospects dark and foreboding. Thus freed from constraint, the number of Presbyterians multiplied in the city, and throughout the State. The church in Charleston was found insufficient to accommodate those who wished to worship with Presbyterians. The house was always crowded, seats could not be procured, except by long delay, and the necessity of another Presbyterian Church became apparent. Previous to 1811, the First Presbyterian Church was the only accommodation for Presbyterians in Charleston. It had been for many years, however, found altogether insufficient for this purpose. As early as the year 1804, the necessity of a new erection was felt, and the design encouraged by Dr. Buist, then pastor of the church. The Rev. James Malcomson who arrived from Ireland, in 1794, and had been settled as pastor for many years in Williamsburg, of this State, was engaged to preach for those who wished to form another congregation, and the temporary use of the French Church was procured. His death, which occurred in September of the same year, blighted the sanguine hopes which were entertained, that ere long another Presbyterian Church and congregation would be formed in Charleston.

Mr. Malcomson was born in the Parish of Castlereagh, in the County of Down, but received the chief part of his education at the University of Glasgow. With his ministerial functions he combined the profession of medicine, which he practiced with no small degree of skill, and it is this profession that gave him the title of Doctor. He had attended medical lectures at Edinburgh, and was a licensed physician. In addition to his pastoral charge, he taught a

large grammar school, at which many received their early education. He was a man of talent, of thorough scholarship, and of pleasing address, and prepossessing person. He wrote his sermons, but was interesting and often eloquent in their delivery. Facetious and genial, he had many and warm friends, and was not without his enemies. In the divisions which rent the church asunder, it was difficult to avoid all obloquy and prejudice, even for those who were the most perfect. He continued to minister to this church till 1804, when he removed to Charleston, where he taught a classical school and preached to a new congregation, increasing in numbers when he was called away, and which was the germ of the Second Presbyterian Church. He died of yellow fever during the summer of 1804, in the thirty-sixth year of his age.

It was not until the year 1809, when the inability to find accommodation in the existing church made the matter urgent, the determination was finally and effectually made to enter upon the formation of the Second Presbyterian Church.

It was on Wednesday evening, February 8th, 1809, that the following gentlemen being assembled at the house of Mr. Fleming, entered into an agreement to unite their efforts to secure a suitable building for a Presbyterian Church, viz.: Benjamin Boyd, William Pressly, John Ellison, Archibald Pagan, George Robertson, Samuel Robertson, William Walton, James Adger, Caleb Gray, John Robinson, Alexander Henry, Samuel Pressly, William Aiken, John Porter. At a subsequent meeting, on March 6th, a subscription paper for the support of a minister was presented, when, by a subscription of a number present of one hundred dollars each for two years, more than a sufficient salary being subscribed, a committee was appointed to request the Rev. Andrew Flinn, then connected with the united congregation of Williamsburg and Indiantown, to organize and take charge of the congregation, with a salary of two thousand dollars. That committee consisted of Benjamin Boyd, John Cunningham, Joseph Milligan, Samuel Robertson and John

Robinson. The invitation, the claims of his charge having been voluntarily surrendered, Mr. Flinn accepted, when a meeting for the formation of a Second Presbyterian Church was held at Trinity Church on Monday evening, April 24th, 1809. Committees were appointed to attend to the secular business, to purchase a site for the erection of a church and to obtain subscriptions. The first standing committee to attend to all the secular affairs of the church, to purchase a site for the church, were Benjamin Boyd, John Cunningham, Joseph Milligan, John Robinson and Samuel Robertson.

The committee to procure subscriptions, consisted of Benjamin Boyd, John Cunningham, Joseph Milligan, Alexander Henry, John Stoney, John Ellison, William Porter, George Robertson, James Gordon, William Aiken, William Walton, William Pressly, John Robinson.

As a record of the munificence of the donors, who were not confined to Presbyterians, it was resolved that the names of the subscribers should be preserved in parchment and deposited in the archives of the church.

By May 16th, the plan of the church was presented by William Gordon, who was appointed to build it, and who immediately entered upon the work. In 1809, an Act of Incorporation was obtained. At a meeting in January 25th, 1810, a subscription paper was presented for the signatures of those who wished to become members of the Second Presbyterian Church, to be governed by prescribed rules and by-laws, when the following persons signed their names, viz: Benjamin Boyd, Stephen Thomas, Robert Fleming, Richard McMillan, Caleb Gray, Richard Cunningham, James Adger, John Porter, William H. Gilliland, Alexander Gray, John Blackwood, John Cunningham, Alexander Henry, John McDowell, William Walton, Samuel Robertson, John Walton, Thomas Fleming, John Robinson, James Begg, George Robertson, J. C. Martindale, John Brownlee, William Scott, John Johnson, Charles Robiou, William Aiken, George Keenan, Archibald Grahame, James Carr, Lewis A. Pitray, James Leman, John Noble, David Bell, James

Evans, John Ellison, B. Casey, William McElmoyle, John Davis, William Pressly, Thomas Johnson, George Miller, James Blocker, Robert Belshaw, Samuel Corrie, Samuel H. Pratt, James Pennal, Thomas A Vardell, John Steele, Nathaniel Slawson, John C. Beile, William Porter, Samuel Patterson, Samuel Browne, John M. Fraser, Thomas Milliken, John Smyth, John Mushet, John Crow, John Geddes, Peter Kennedy, James Wall, Charles Martin, Alexander Howard, William Thompson, John Dunn, William Smith, Sr., William L. Shaw, Edward Carew, C. B. Duhadway, Samuel Pilsbury, William Scott, R. Galbraith, Richard Fair, Edward McGrath, James Cooper, William Simms.

In order that the church might be opened for the reception of Harmony Presbytery, at its first session, it was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, by a sermon from the Rev. Dr. Flinn, on Wednesday, April 3d, 1811; and connected with the ecclesiastical judicatories of the Presbyterian Church. This was the first session ever held in Charleston by a Presbytery connected with the General Assembly of the "Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

The Charleston Union Presbytery also held its first session in this church, April 10th, 1823.

Although great munificence was exercised by the founders of this church, its cost far exceeded both their expectations and their means. By the account of the Treasurer presented up to April, 1812, it appears that the sum of fifty-five thousand, five hundred and forty-eight dollars had been expended, and that a large amount would be still necessary to carry out the plans and pay the incurred debt. To meet this, a heavy assessment was laid upon the pews of the church in March, 1811; and another, to three times the amount, in December, 1815. Notwithstanding these efforts, in June, 1816, it appeared that the sum of thirty-one thousand, one hundred and fifty-six dollars, twenty-five cents, was still due, when it was resolved to sell all the pews on which the assessment had not been paid. There still, however, remained in May, 1822, a debt of twenty-two

thousand dollars hanging upon the church, and which, in April, 1823, had increased to twenty-three thousand four hundred and eighty-five dollars. The standing committee feeling the great importance of removing in some way this oppressive burden, reported in 1823 a plan of relieving the church of this debt, by transferring the whole property and temporal jurisdiction of the church to an association, who should assume the debt as their own, engaging however, that the Confession of Faith as moulded by the General Assembly, should ever be the rule of government to the church, as well as in doctrine as in discipline. The report was adopted at a meeting in August, 1823, and in the same month the committee reported that they had obtained subscriptions for the extinction of the debt, amounting to sixteen thousand and twenty-five dollars, and in April, 1824, the same committee stated that all the debts of the church had been settled.

Thus was this beautiful temple, at a cost of more than one hundred thousand dollars, finally erected and delivered from all incumbrances, by the energy, union, and concerted liberality of its founders.

The burden of its debt having been removed from the congregation, it was now prepared to take into consideration the possibility of lessening the evils suggested by Dr. Smyth, occasioned by the immensity of the auditorium. And it was with much pleasure and gratification that he testified to the readiness and liberality with which in 1833, it entered upon that series of alterations, which terminated so beneficial in the present greatly improved condition and aspect of the church. By these alterations, while no injury was done to the appearance of the church, the capacity of the audience room was diminished by lowering the ceiling, raising the floor, and taking sufficient space from the front to make a convenient vestibule, and a commodious room above, which could be used for a Sunday School, or lecture room, and a library.

It was found in 1874, that a new roof was needed for the safety and preservation of the building, and the sum of six

thousand was raised in a time of great financial stringency. In his handsome tribute to the "noble ladies," President C. H. Simonton said: "The work could not have been finished without their generous co-operation." The amount raised by them was eighteen hundred dollars. In the great cyclone of August 27th, 1813, this church sustained considerable injury; the lead that covered the top of the roof, with a large portion of the slate, were raised and carried away, and some of the sashes of the windows were blown away.

In 1855, when other churches were seriously damaged by the cyclone, this received a comparatively slight injury.

In the memorable earthquake of 1886, which threatened the city with destruction, this church was damaged to the amount of six thousand dollars, but through the kind and generous benefaction of friends abroad, from both South and North, chiefly from the latter, the congregation were enabled, speedily, to restore their shattered walls.

In August 27th, 1893, this church again suffered severely from the most destructive cyclone that has ever visited our city. The building was completely unroofed on the north side, the pews and organ deluged with water, and the whole ceiling so damaged as to necessitate its removal. The sum required to restore the building was three thousand three hundred dollars, which was partially covered by an insurance of thirteen hundred.

Only such repairs were made immediately after the earthquake as were deemed necessary for safety. The work of complete restoration and improvement was deferred until the pastor's summer vacation. The actual damages by the quake were not visible to the ordinary observer, who saw only the shattered walls and broken ceiling.

Beginning with the tower, it was found necessary to make such changes in the contiguous walls and galleries as would remedy the settling of the foundations nearly six inches. The unsightly block on the summit of the tower was replaced by an elegant gilded vane, and the old lightning rod removed. In the south vestibule, a convenient room was

added for the pastor. The organ was retired twelve feet into the old lecture room, which is no longer used for religious services, thus enlarging the orchestra and giving ample room for the choir. The whole building received a new coat of paint, both on the inside and outside. No change was made in the interior walls. The venerable pulpit, of rich Spanish mahogany, and of richer hallowed associations was retained as far as possible, and at the same time to accomodate it to a low platform. The pews were recushioned by the congregation. The new and beautiful carpet is the generous gift of one of the members. The group of windows back of the pulpit was improved by the substitution of stained glass.

Previous to the time of Dr. Henry, the weekly lectures were delivered, and the prayer meeting held at private residences ; but in January, 1824, at the urgency of Dr. Henry, the corporation procured a temporary building in St. Philip Street. A lot of land was, however, soon leased in Black Bird's Alley, now Burns' Lane, at fifty dollars per annum, and a lecture room erected through the efforts of the ladies of the congregation, at a cost of about seven hundred dollars. But this building being too small and the location unfavorable, it was resolved in 1835, to procure a more suitable building in a more eligible situation.

A beautiful, and more creditable edifice was erected in Society Street, and dedicated in March, 1837. This lecture room was destroyed in the great fire of 1838. It was afterwards rebuilt, and subsequently sold. It was in these lecture rooms that Dr. Smyth delivered to crowded audiences, of every class his masterly discourses on "*Apostolical Succession*," and "*Presbytery and Prelacy*," which were afterwards published and used as text books in several theological seminaries.

In 1881, the need of a new and more convenient Sunday School building was beginning to be deeply felt, and steps were taken to procure funds for its erection, resulting in the organization of a society called the "Sunday School Workers," which in the course of nine years raised three

thousand dollars. In November, 1881, a lot was purchased, at a cost of twelve hundred and seven dollars. The elegant building was completed at a cost of ten thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars, and dedicated May, 1887.

The Sunday School of the Second Presbyterian Church, was organized in the year 1818 by Mr. and Mrs. George E. Hahnbaum. It was the second Sunday School organized in this city. Mr. and Mrs. Hahnbaum were both members of the Congregational (or Circular) Church, of Charleston, and they had, about two years previous started in connection with that church, the first Sunday School in the city. This attracted the attention of some of the members of the Second Presbyterian Church, and in 1818 an invitation was extended to Mr. and Mrs. Hahnbaum to organize a school there.

The first superintendent of the school, was Mr. Geo. E. Hahnbaum himself, assisted by Mrs. Hahnbaum. It was organized as distinct from the church, and was not, at that time, under the direction of the session. For this, and other reasons, the Rev. Dr. Flinn, the pastor of the church opposed it, regarding the work as too secular in its nature. But he was soon convinced of its usefulness, and was ever after its zealous supporter.

In 1822, when the school was firmly established, Mr. and Mrs. Hahnbaum returned to the Circular Church, and the Rev. Basil Gildersleeve was elected superintendent of the school, which office he held until 1839. During a part of his administration he was assisted by Mr. Charles S. Simonton.

This church always manifested a deep and affectionate interest in the colored people, who filled the galleries of the church and largely composed its membership, at one time numbering two hundred. During the forty years of Dr. Smyth's ministry, he was accustomed to prepare sermons with special reference to their instruction, and held a special service for them during the week. He was a warm supporter of the Zion Colored Church, in Anson Street, and of the Rev. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., in his ministry to the peo-

ple. At the time we now refer to, this church furnished a dozen teachers for the colored Sunday-school in Anson Street. "The erection of a beautiful and commodious edifice for the special accommodation of the colored people, the employment of an able minister to labor among them, and the self-denial with which some have persevered in imparting to their catechetical instruction," said Dr. Smyth, "will ever be to your praise."

Reference is here made to the church in Calhoun Street, to which the growing congregation in Anson Street removed, and where multitudes of colored people were gathered into the Presbyterian Church. The first pastor of this "Zion Church," as it was called, was the Rev. John B. Adger, D. D., for twelve years a zealous missionary in Smyrna, and who labored among this people with equal devotion. For several months after the resignation of Dr. Adger, the church was supplied by the Rev. Ferdinand Jacobs, D. D., when the Rev. John L. Girardeau, D. D., entered upon his long and useful ministry among this people. This valuable building on Calhoun Street, is gratuitously furnished to the colored people as a place of worship.

The first pastor of this church was the Rev. Andrew Flinn, D. D. He was called in February, 1809; installed April 4th, 1811, and died February 24th, 1820, having been eleven years connected with the church. Mr. Flinn was born in the State of Maryland, in the year 1773, of honest and pious, but humble parentage. When he was about a year old the family emigrated to Mecklenburg County, N. C., where his father died in 1875. Thus he was left to the care of a widowed mother, with six small children, and with stinted means for their support. Some of his friends, however, observing that he was a youth of extraordinary promise, encouraged him to commence a course of study and volunteered their aid to enable him to prosecute it. He entered the University of North Carolina, where he graduated with considerable distinction in 1799. He engaged in the study of theology, under the care of the Presbytery of

Orange, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1800. His first efforts in the pulpit excited great attention, and marked him as one of the most popular candidates of the day. Having preached for some time in Hillsboro and in some other places, he accepted, in January, 1803, an invitation to supply the pulpit in Fayetteville, where he was ordained to the work of the ministry, and installed pastor. Mr. Flinn was indefatigable as a pastor, and was obliged, besides, to teach school in order to make out a competent support. But these united labors became so oppressive, that in 1805 he was compelled to resign his charge. He now removed to Camden, S. C., where he was instrumental in organizing and building up a very respectable Presbyterian congregation. After laboring there for a short time, he went to Williamsburg County and preached for a while to the churches of Bethel and Indiantown. But it was not long before he visited Charleston and preached several times in the Scotch Presbyterian Church. So great was the sensation produced by his fervid eloquence, that he was immediately invited to take charge of the Second Presbyterian Church. When this new church was in process of erection, the congregation obtained the use of a vacant Methodist place of worship, in which Mr. Flinn commenced his ministry.

In November, of this year, he was honored with the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of North Carolina. In 1812 he was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

On February 24th, 1820, in the forty-eighth year of his age, after a long and painful illness, Dr. Flinn was removed from the scene of his earthly labors. In his last moments, he, with an affectionate farewell of his mourning family and friends, and this with perfect composure, raised his hands and eyes to heaven and said, "Jesus, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Mr. Flinn was twice married. His first wife was Martha H. Walker, who died in 1808, the mother of one daughter, who was married to the Rev. John Dick-

son. His second wife was Mrs. Eliza Grimball, widow of John Grimball, by whom he had no issue.

After the death of Dr. Flinn, the church was supplied by such transient ministers as could be obtained, until April, 1820, when the Rev. Artemus Boies, pastor of the Church of Wilmington, N. C., who had been recommended by Dr. Flinn, was called to supply the church for one year, during the rebuilding of the church at Wilmington, which had been burnt. He was elected pastor in April, 1821, and continued to labor until May, 1823, when he tendered his resignation.

In November, 1823, it was unanimously resolved to call the Rev. Thomas Charlton Henry to the pastoral charge for one year. This call was very soon made permanent and accepted, and Mr. Henry was installed by the Charleston Union Presbytery January, 1824. He died October 5th, 1827, having been connected with the church only four years. The Rev. T. C. Henry was the son of Alexander Henry, of Philadelphia, the venerable and devoted President of the American Sunday School Union, and an Elder in the Central Presbyterian Church. He was born September 22d, 1790. At his birth, and during his childhood, his father repeatedly devoted him to the ministry; but his early years were passed with great buoyancy of spirit, and love of pleasure, though he had withal a considerable fondness for books. His father was disposed to indulge his literary tastes by giving him the best advantages for improvement. At the age of eighteen he was placed at mercantile business. This, however, proved distasteful to him, and he returned to literary pursuits, and was graduated from Middleburg College, Vermont, in August, 1814, with distinction. Having meantime experienced the saving power of divine grace, he devoted himself to the sacred ministry. To fit himself for this work, he took a course of theological study at Princeton Seminary, N. J., where he was a diligent student for two years. He was licensed to preach by the Philadelphia Presbytery April 17, 1816, but in October following was dismissed to Newcastle Presbytery, by which he was

subsequently ordained. For two successive years he performed gratuitously the work of a missionary. Several months of this period were passed at Lexington, Ky., where he had great popularity as a preacher. From Lexington he was called to the First Presbyterian Church in Columbia, S. C., of which he was installed pastor in 1818, by the Presbytery of Harmony. After a prosperous ministry of five years, he received a unanimous call to this church to become their pastor. In the first and second years of his ministry considerable additions were made to the church, but in the third, a blessed effusion of the Spirit was enjoyed. His indefatigable labors during this season rendered a period of relaxation indispensable, and he therefore embarked for Liverpool in April, 1826. During the four or five months of his stay in Europe, he travelled through the principal parts of Great Britain and France. He returned early in December, and with redoubled vigor entered upon his labors. On the first of October, 1827, when in the enjoyment of perfect health, he was suddenly seized with the yellow fever, then prevalent in this city, and of a malignant type, which in four days terminated his valuable life, at the early age of thirty-seven. From the beginning he manifested unqualified submission to the Divine will, and he conversed with his friends in the most comforting and rapturous manner, testifying to the power of his Redeemer's love and grace. The following is a list of Dr. Henry's publications: A Plea for the West; A Sermon before the Missionary Society of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, 1824; The Song of Ascent; A Sermon preached on the fourteenth anniversary of the Dedication of the Second Presbyterian Church, 1825; Popular Amusements, 12 mo., 1825; Letters to an Anxious Enquirer, 12 mo., 1827; Etchings from the Religious World, 12 mo. His "Letters to an Anxious Enquirer" have been twice published in America, the second edition under the auspices, and with a commendatory preface, of the Rev. Dr. Bedell, and also in London, with an introduction by Dr. Pye Smith. The account of his death is also published in a volume of the

London Tract Society, as an eminent exhibition of the triumph of divine grace.

After the melancholy death of Dr. Henry, the church remained two years without a pastor, though faithfully supplied by the Rev. Benjamin Gildersleeve, and the Rev. A. Leland, D. D. Various and unsuccessful efforts were made to obtain the services of a suitable minister.

In June, 1828, the Rev. Alonzo Church, of Georgia, received a call which he declined. In September, the Rev. E. N. Kirk, was elected pastor, but he also refused to come. In February, 1829, the Rev. William Ashmead, being in Charleston, on account of his health, received a call. In March he accepted of his appointment, and was in May, installed pastor. On June 7th, he obtained leave of absence for the summer, with the intention of bringing his family, but he died on his return in Philadelphia, December 2d, 1829, having been connected with this church but little more than six months, of which he was absent more than four. Mr. Ashmead was born in Philadelphia, in 1797. From his earliest youth he was devoted to books and retirement, and was remarked by Dr. Rush as a youth of fine promise. He studied in the University of Pennsylvania, and was graduated in 1848. Having chosen as his future profession the Gospel Ministry, he studied under the Rev. James P. Wilson, of Philadelphia. Mr. Ashmead was compelled to teach by day and study by night, and thus laid the foundation for his future infirmities. In 1820, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Philadelphia. He received a call from the Presbyterian Church in Lancaster, Pa., where he labored more than eight years previous to his call to this church. Mr. Ashmead, considering his age, was an accomplished and thorough scholar. He read with ease the French, Spanish and Italian languages, and had made some proficiency in German also, when his declining health obliged him to relinquish it. In the winter of 1825, he commenced a translation of Saurin's Historical, Critical and Theological Discourses, but in this labor also, after he had made considerable progress, he was arrested by ill

health. In 1826, he published an essay on pauperism, addressed to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in which was displayed great ingenuity, and power of argument. Since his death, a volume of sermons has been issued from the press, to which is prefixed an interesting memoir by the lamented Grimké, who was his warm friend, and held him in high estimation.

After the death of Mr. Ashmead, the church sat in her widowhood for several years, receiving her food from occasional supplies, especially from her tried friend, the Rev. Benj. Gildersleeve.

In August, 1830, the Rev. Alexander Aikman received an unsuccessful call. In April, 1831, a similar call was presented to the Rev. J. B. Waterbury.

In April, 1832, the Rev. Thomas Smyth was called to this church. He was born in Belfast, Ireland, on the 14th of June, 1808, of English and Scotch parentage. He was of so frail a constitution that no one expected him to live beyond the period of childhood. He entered the Institute at Belfast, which was then connected with what is now the Queen's College, as a preparatory or high school. His academical career was bright with glowing prophecies of his future eminence. In 1827, at the age of nineteen, he became a student at Belfast College, where he won prizes in every branch of study. It was within these classic walls that, under the private instructions of the famous tragedian, Sheridan Knowles, he began to develop those powers of elocution, which afterwards gave him a place among the princes of pulpit oratory.

He was twenty-one years of age when he made a public profession of his faith in Christ. His father was an elder for many years in the Presbyterian Church, of which Dr. Samuel Hanna (father of Dr. Wm. Hanna) was pastor. "The Presbyterian Church, at this time," he writes, "was sadly degenerated, both in doctrine and discipline, and the erection of an Independent Church on principles of evangelical purity, was received with favor. In this church I was brought up." He prosecuted his theological studies at

Highbury College, in London. In addition to his theological studies he attended a course of scientific lectures in London. But his feeble constitution began to relax under the constant and unremitting strain of exhausting study. He believed he was sinking into rapid decline, and all his bright hopes of entering the ministry began to wither. At this painful crisis his parents were preparing to remove to America, where the most of their children were already settled. He embarked with his parents for New York in August, 1830. He connected himself with the Presbyterian Church of which Dr. Fisher was pastor, and by whom he was introduced to Newark Presbytery. He entered the senior class of Princeton Seminary, but before graduating received a call to this church November, 1831, and was installed by Charleston Union Presbytery December 29th, 1834.

In 1832 he married the eldest daughter of Mr. James Adger, of Charleston, S. C. His long and useful ministry began and ended with this favored people, extending over a period of forty years. "For her," he said, "I have given myself, and all that I have—my time, talents, acquisitions, substance, and strength." He declined complimentary and enticing calls in every direction, from the college, the seminary, and the editorial chair, saying: "I am determined to live and die with my people." He was an indefatigable student and a voluminous author, and published in all about thirty volumes, embracing almost every subject of public interest. Dr. Smyth collected probably the largest private library which has ever been gathered in this country, numbering at one time nearly *twenty thousand* volumes. For general improvement, and to gratify a long cherished taste for the sciences, he attended the medical lectures in the College of Charleston for two seasons and pursued the study privately. He also read Blackstone and other treatises on law, together with a course of classical literature and general science. He was an enthusiastic member of the Gentlemen's Literary Club, and also of the Charleston Bible Society.

In the prime of his manhood, Dr. Smyth was stricken with paralysis, and in 1853, when he was on his return from the General Assembly, he was again stricken so severely that, for a time, all hopes of his life were given up. His indomitable energy of will, with the divine blessing, however, sustained him, and though ever after a cripple, he persevered to the end in the work to which he had devoted his life, and on the 20th of August, 1873, he quietly entered into his rest. His last thoughts were for the people of his love, for whom he was struggling to deliver his dying message.

It deserves to be mentioned here that Dr. Smyth was assisted at different periods of his ministry, when disqualified by infirmity for discharging its functions, by the following ministers, whose faithful labors are held in grateful remembrance: Rev. Henry M. Smith, D. D., Rev. D. L. Buttolph, D. D., Rev. Ferdinand Jacobs, D. D., Rev. James McDowell, and Rev. Hampden C. DuBose, D. D.

In May, 1871, the Rev. Gilbert R. Brackett was invited to supply the vacant pulpit for a year, Dr. Smyth being pastor emeritus, and on the 16th of June, 1872, was installed pastor, which office he still holds.

LIST OF OFFICERS OF THIS CHURCH FROM ITS ORGANIZATION IN 1809:

Pastors.

Rev. Andrew Flinn, D. D., 1809; Rev. Artemas Boies, 1820; Rev. Thomas Charlton Henry, D. D., 1823; Rev. William Ashmead, 1829; Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D., 1832; Rev. Gilbert R. Brackett, D. D., June, 1872.

Elders.

Benj. Boyd, 1810; Stephen Thomas, 1810; John Cunningham, 1810; Wm. Pressly, 1812; David Bell, 1812; Henry Bennett, 1812; John Todd, 1821; Thomas Fleming, 1821; James Black, 1821; Israel C. Anthony; Charles O'Neal, 1825; Robert Wright, 1825; Charles S. Simonton, 1837; Thomas R. Vardell, 1837; John DeWees, 1837; George

Moffett, 1840; William Dearing, 1845; William Yeadon, 1845; William C. Dukes, 1845; William Harrall, 1845; William Adger, 1845; D. W. Harrison, 1845; James M. Caldwell, 1846; John Caldwell, 1846; Robert S. Wright, 1852; Hugh Wilson, 1852; Hugh R. Banks, 1852; S. S. Clark, 1852; James Dillingham, 1853; Archibald Campbell, 1853; Robert Adger, 1855; F. D. Fanning, 1855; A. F. Browning, 1855; James S. Chambers, 1855; Robert C. Gilchrist, 1867; Wm. J. Smith, 1867; Dr. D. J. Cain, 1867; George S. Cook, 1867; Alfred R. Stillman, 1869; J. Adger Smyth, 1869; John S. Bird, 1876; John S. Roberts, 1881; James Allan, 1881; C. N. Averill, 1888; James E. Edgerton, 1888; William B. Hills, 1888; Augustine T. Smythe, 1893; James N. Robson, 1893; John B. Adger, Jr., 1893; Frank F. Whilden, 1893; James Allan, Jr., 1899.

Deacons.

John S. Bird, 1851; James S. Chambers, 1851; Dr. John Anderson, 1851; A. F. Browning, 1851; Robert C. Gilchrist, 1853; John V. Lyon, 1853; George S. Cook, 1853; Wm. J. Smith, 1855; James S. Roberts, 1855; George H. Moffett, 1855; Thomas S. Jones, 1855; Edward Fogartie, 1856; Wm. John Johnson, 1856; William DeWees, 1856; John Knox, 1856; F. D. Whitney, 1867; J. N. Robson, 1867; J. Adger Smyth, 1867; James Allan, 1867; C. N. Averill, 1867; Augustine T. Smythe, 1869; Edwin F. Miscally, 1876; George L. G. Cook, 1876; Oscar E. Johnson, 1881; Robert E. Seabrook, 1888; John B. Adger, Jr., 1888; Frank F. Whilden, 1888; W. W. Houston, 1888; Hall T. McGee, 1893; Geo. H. Moffett, 1893; William S. Allan, 1893; John W. Robson, 1893; James Robinson Williams, 1893; Robert C. Lebbly, 1893; R. M. Masters, 1899; Robert A. Smyth, 1899.

Presidents of the Corporation.

Benj. Boyd, 1809; Samuel Robertson, 1810; Stephen Thomas, 1813; Wm. Smith, 1815; Samuel Patterson, 1818; Thomas Fleming, 1819; John Robinson, 1821; James Black, 1823; James Adger, 1823; Wm. Smith, 1825; Alexander

Black, 1827; John Robinson, 1828; Wm. Smith, Sen., 1834; Alexander Black, 1838; Alexander Brown, 1840; John Robinson, 1841; William C. Dukes, 1845; Alexander Black, 1847; H. R. Banks, 1849; Robert Adger, 1850; N. F. Browning, 1854; Fleetwood Lanneau, 1856; William C. Dukes, 1858; Wm. J. Smith, 1859; George S Cook, 1866; Charles H. Simonton, 1867; A. McD. Brown, 1876; Ellison A. Smyth, 1878, Hall T. McGee, 1881; J. Adger Smyth, 1887.

The following members of this church have entered the Gospel Ministry: Rev. John B. Adger, D. D.; Rev. D. McNeill Turner, D. D.; Rev. George C. Logan; Rev. William S. Hughes; Rev. Donald J. Auld; Rev. Charles A. Stillman, D. D.; Rev. Arnold W. Miller, D. D.; Rev. Robert Small; Rev. Thos. J. Girardeau; Rev. James E. White; Rev. Arthur Small; Rev. E. H. Bolles; Rev. Wm. J. McCormick, D. D.; Rev. Wm. B. Corbett, D. D.; Rev. D. L. Buttolph, D. D.; Rev. E. G. Walker; Rev. James T. Waite; Rev. Matthew Green; Rev. R. M. McCormick, D. D.; Rev. E. O. Frierson, D. D.; Rev. James J. Chisolm, D. D.; Rev. C. E. Chichester; Rev. Wm. G. Vardell; Rev. E. B. Hort.

INSCRIPTIONS FROM MURAL TABLETS.

Rev. Andrew Flinn, D. D. Sacred to the memory of the Rev. Andrew Flinn, D. D., who departed this life on the 24th of February Anno Domini 1820, in the XLVII year of his age. He was the first Pastor of this Church. Under his ministry the congregation was formed, and this Temple dedicated to the service of Almighty God. He was an accomplished Scholar, an able Theologian, an eloquent, and impressive Preacher of the Gospel, a faithful and affectionate Pastor. In his private life, he was distinguished for his affability, condescension, and benevolence, and for his exemplary conduct in the endearing relations of Husband, Parent, Friend and Master. To the Stranger he was hospitable, to his country an ardent friend. To Public Institu-

tions, he was uniformly generous. As a Citizen he was independent and of unsullied integrity. Through life he devoted himself to his Redeemer, to whom he committed his soul, triumphing in death, leaving an example worthy of the imitation of every worthy Christian. As a testimony of their affection, and veneration for his virtues, his bereaved congregation have erected this monument. *Deus nobis Refugium.*

Reverend Thomas Charlton Henry, D. D. This Tablet is erected to the Memory of their late faithful Pastor, the Reverend Thomas Charlton Henry, D. D., who finished his course Oct. 5, 1827, aged 37 years and 13 days. Actuated by the noblest motives, wealth, talents, and every other distinction he counted but loss, that he might bear the exalted character of a Minister of the Gospel of Christ. To this adorable Name, his theme, his hope and his joy, which gave energy to his principles, and success to his labors, he consecrated a superior mind, extensive acquirements, and eminent endowments; having been the instrument of gathering many souls into the fold of his Redeemer. In his last moments, when every earthly consolation vanished, his soul sweetly reposed upon the grace which bore him through triumphant,

Reverend William Ashmead. To this marble tablet is entrusted the pious office of recording the Life, the Virtues, the Talents, and the Death of the Reverend William Ashmead. He was a native of Philadelphia; graduated there in 1818; was ordained in 1820; and on the 17th of May, 1829, was installed as pastor of this church. He died at Philadelphia, 2d December, 1829, aged 32, leaving behind him a widow and six children. Talents, erudition and scholarship, won for him admiration. His Christian graces, whilst they endeared him to such as worshipped God, like himself, in spirit and in truth, commanded the respect and esteem of all who valued, promoted and honored religion, as a living fountain of public felicity and duty, usefulness and glory; and in all the relations of private character, of

purity, harmony and peace, of order, beauty and love. His widow and children, his relatives and friends attest, in tears of earthly grief, yet of heavenly faith and hope, the loveliness and worth of his social and domestic life. As a man, sensible and discreet, amiable, benevolent and polished. As a Husband, a Father, and a Friend, considerate and judicious, faithful and affectionate, cordial, respectful, and constant. As a scholar, enthusiastic in study, and various in knowledge, accomplished in taste, and disciplined in mind. As a pastor and a preacher, he was apostolic; in life, doctrine, discipline, worship, faithful and courteous, kind, candid and thoughtful, eloquent and fearless, zealous, yet liberal. As a Christian, in purity of heart, in singleness of purpose, in humanity of spirit, in the depth and breadth, and height of faith, hope and charity. He was indeed, an Israelite without guile. In life, the servant of God and man; in death, the purified, happy spirit of a just man made perfect. Here in the sanctuary that he loved, honored and adorned, the corporation of the Second Presbyterian Church have dedicated this silent, yet faithful marble, as an enduring witness of their love, and an affectionate memorial of his merits.

Reverend Thomas Smyth, D. D. This tablet is erected by his bereaved and loving people to the memory of the Reverend Thomas Smyth, D. D., who died August 20th, 1873, aged 65. Called to be pastor of this church in April, 1832, he here labored for more than forty years, devoting to this his first and only charge, the whole of his ministerial life, his eminent talents, his boundless stores of learning, and the undivided affections of a warm and generous heart. A preacher of thrilling and fervid eloquence, a devoted and sympathizing pastor, a learned and voluminous author, an influential leader in the church, a master spirit of the age, he faithfully labored with an unabated energy, and an indomitable will, through years of protracted sufferings, cheerfully borne, until the Christian warrior was called to receive his crown.

TABLETS IN THE VESTIBULE.

Original Founders of this Church, February 8, 1809:

Benj. Boyd, Alexander Henry, Wm. Walton, James Adger, Wm. Aiken, John Parker, Caleb Gray, Samuel Robertson, Wm. Pressly, Samuel Pressly, John Ellison, Archibald Pagan, George Robertson, John Robertson.

Pastor, Rev. Andrew Flinn, D. D.

President, Benj. Boyd.

Building Committee, John Cunningham, chairman; Alexander Henry, John McDowell, Wm. Aiken, Samuel Robertson, Stephen Thomas, Wm. Parker, John Brownlee, John Geddes.

Architects, James and John Gordon.

Two new tablets were inserted in the walls of the vestibule, after the earthquake, bearing the following inscriptions:

This church was seriously injured by the earthquake, August 31, 1886; was partly repaired and occupied October 31, 1886. By the liberal assistance of Presbyterians from all parts of our country, the repairs were completed October 9, 1887.

Pastor, Rev. G. R. Brackett, D. D.

President, J. Adger Smyth.

Building Committee, Hall T. McGee, chairman; S. R. Marshall, James Allan, J. Adger Smyth, H. C. Robertson.

On the wall of the vestibule of the Sunday-School building is the following tablet:

This building was dedicated May 22d, 1887. Pastor, Rev. G. R. Brackett, D. D.; superintendent, A. T. Smythe; vice superintendent, Frank F. Whilden; president, Hall T. McGee; building committee, J. Adger Smyth, chairman; S. R. Marshall, James Allan, H. C. Robertson, H. T. McGee; Gus E. Leo, architect; C. McK. Grant, builder.

DR. J. H. THORNWELL'S LETTER
TO
GOVERNOR MANNING
ON
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
IN
SOUTH CAROLINA,

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN NOVEMBER, 1853,

Republished in the editions of THE NEWS AND COURIER
July, 1885,

BY
THE CITY COUNCIL OF CHARLESTON
FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE PEOPLE.

*Hon. C. G. Munroe
with McCutcheon's Complaint -
1885*

DR. J. H. THORNWELL'S LETTER

TO

GOVERNOR MANNING

ON

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

IN

SOUTH CAROLINA,

ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN NOVEMBER, 1853,

Republished in the editions of THE NEWS AND COURIER,
July, 1885,

BY

THE CITY COUNCIL OF CHARLESTON

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE PEOPLE.

THIS EDITION IN PAMPHLET FORM IS ISSUED BY A COMMITTEE OF CITIZENS FOR
FREE CIRCULATION THROUGHOUT THE STATE.

CHARLESTON, S. C.
THE NEWS AND COURIER BOOK PRESSES.
1885.



DR. J. H. THORNWELL'S LETTER
TO
GOVERNOR MANNING
ON
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE, {
November, 1853. }

To His Excellency Governor Manning:

I ask the favor of presenting to your Excellency a few reflections upon the subject of public instruction in South Carolina. As I feel that I am addressing one whose interest and zeal in the prosperity of letters will induce him to weigh with candor, to estimate with charity, and even to invest with disproportionate value, the crudest hints which spring from the desire to increase the educational facilities of the State, I shall dismiss all apprehensions of being suspected of an officious obtrusion upon your notice. You are the man, above all others, to whom the head of this institution should look with confidence to give fresh impulse to the general cause of education, and you will excuse me for saying that if the suggestions which shall fall from me, or the maturer recommendations which shall come from yourself, shall terminate auspiciously to the wishes of us both, there will be furnished a beautiful instance of providential retribution, in connecting the name of the first conspicuous benefactor of the South Carolina College with the establishment of an adequate system of common schools. A proud distinction in itself to be the friend and patron of learning, the honor is increased in your case in that it has been pre-eminently your care, in its higher and lower culture, to dispense its blessings to the poor. Apart from fellowship with

God, there cannot be a sweeter satisfaction than that which arises from the consciousness of being a father to the fatherless; and if the ends which I know are dear to your heart can only be achieved, every indigent child in the State, looking upon you as its real father, may address you in the modest and glowing terms which the genius of Milton has canonized as fit expressions of gratitude for the noblest of all gifts:

At tibi, chare pater, postquam non æqua merenti
 Posse referre datur, nec dona rependere factis,
 Sit memorasse satis, repetitaque munera grato
 Percensere animo, fideique reponere menti.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE SUBJECT.

I am not insensible to the dangers and difficulties which attend the discussion of this subject. It is so seductive to the fancy that the temptation is almost irresistible to indulge in schemes and visionary projects. In the effort to realize the conception of a perfect education we are apt to forget that there is no such thing as absolute perfection in the matter, that all excellence is relative, and that the highest recommendation of any plan is, that it is at once practicable and adjusted to the wants and condition of those for whom it is provided. A system of public instruction, like the form of government, must spring from the manners, maxims, habits and associations of the people. It must penetrate their character, constitute an element of their national existence, be a portion of themselves, if it would not be suspected as an alien, or distrusted as a spy. The success of the Prussian scheme is ascribed by Cousin to the circumstance that it existed in the manners and customs of the country before it was enacted into law. It was not a foreign graft, but the natural offshoot of popular opinion and practice. It is an easy thing to construct a theory, when nothing is to be done but to trace the coherencies and dependencies of thought; but it is not so easy to make thought correspond to reality, or to devise a plan which

shall overlook none of the difficulties and obstructions in the way of successful application. In the suggestions which I have to offer, I shall endeavor to keep steadily in view the real wants of the citizens of this Commonwealth, and avoiding all crotchets and metaphysical abstractions, shall aim exclusively at what experience or the nature of the case demonstrates to be practicable. I have no new principle to ventilate, but I shall think myself happy if I can succeed in setting in a clearer light, or vindicating from prejudice and misconstruction, the principles which have already been embodied in our laws. It is, perhaps, not generally known that the Legislature of South Carolina contemplates a scheme of public instruction as perfect in its conception of the end as it is defective in its provision of the means. The order, too, in which the attention of the Legislature has been turned to the various branches of the subject, though not the most popular or the most obvious, is precisely the order of their relative importance. It began where it ought to have begun, but, unfortunately, stopped where it ought not to have stopped. To defend what it has already done, and stimulate it to repentance for what it has not done, is the principal motive of this communication.

OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

Permit me, in pursuance of this design, to direct the attention of your Excellency to the nature, operation and defect of the system among us. This system consists of the South Carolina College, established in 1801; of the free schools, established in 1811, and of the Arsenal and Citadel Academies. This series of institutions is evidently adjusted without, perhaps, any conscious purpose of doing so, to a threefold division of education, in so far as it depends upon instruction, into liberal, elementary and professional. The College is to furnish the means of liberal, the free schools of elementary, and the Arsenal and Citadel Academies of that department and professional education which looks to the arts of practical life, especially those of the

soldier. For the liberal or learned professions, those of law, physic and divinity, no provision has been made. The College undertakes to give the same kind of instruction which is given by the faculty of arts and philosophy in the Universities of Europe. Our military academies, with a slight change in their organization, might be converted into scientific schools, and free schools are, or were, designed to be substantially the same as the elementary and grammar schools of England. The scheme as here developed, though far from fulfilling the logical requirements of a complete system of public instruction, is amply sufficient, if adequately carried out, to meet the real wants of our people. The kind and degree of education for which there is any serious or extensive demand, is what is provided for. To make the system logically complete there would have to be a succession of institutions individually perfect and yet harmoniously co-operating to a general result, which, taking the man at the very dawn of his powers, shall be able to carry him up to the highest point of their expansion, and fit him for any employment in which intelligence and thought are the conditions of success. It should supply the means to every individual in the community of becoming trained and prepared for his own peculiar destiny—it should overlook no class, it should neglect no pursuit. It may be doubted whether a scheme so comprehensive in its plan is desirable—it is quite certain that it is not practicable. The Legislature has done wisely in confining its arrangements to liberal and elementary education. It has aimed, by a preliminary discipline, to put the individual in a condition to educate himself for the business of his life, except where his calling involves an application of scientific knowledge which does not enter into the curriculum of general instruction. In that case it has made a special provision. I see, then, no improvement that can be made in the general features of our scheme; it is as perfect in its conception as the wants and condition of our people will justify. All that the Legislature should aim at is the adjustment of the details, and the better adaptation of them to the end in view.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA COLLEGE.

The first in the order of establishment, as well as the first in the order of importance, is the College. Devoted to the interests of general, in contradistinction from professional education, its design is to cultivate the mind without reference to any ulterior pursuits. "The student is considered as an end to himself; his perfection, as a man simply, being the aim of his education." The culture of the mind, however, for itself, contributes to its perfection as an instrument, so that general education, while it directly prepares and qualifies for no special destination, indirectly trains for every vocation in which success is dependent upon intellectual exertion. It has taught the mind the use of its powers, and imparted those habits without which its powers would be useless; it makes men, and consequently promotes every enterprise in which men are to act. General education being the design of the College, the fundamental principles of its organization are easily deduced. The selection of studies must be made, not with reference to the comparative importance of their matter, or the practical value of the knowledge, but with reference to their influence in unfolding and strengthening the powers of the mind; as the end is to improve mind, the fitness for the end is the prime consideration. "As knowledge," says Sir William Hamilton (man being now considered as an end to himself), "is only valuable as it exercises, and by this exercise develops and invigorates the mind, so a University, in its liberal faculty, should especially prefer these objects of study which call forth the strongest and most unexclusive energy of thought, and so teach them too that this energy shall be most fully elicited in the student." For speculative knowledge, of whatever kind, is only profitable to the student in his liberal cultivation, inasmuch as it supplies him with the object and occasion of exerting his faculties; since powers are only developed in proportion as they are exercised, that is, put forth into energy. The mere possession of scientific truths is, for its own sake, valueless; and education is only educa-

tion, inasmuch as it at once determines and enables the student to educate himself. Hence, the introduction of studies upon the ground of their practical utility is, *pro tanto*, subversive of the College. It is not its office to make planters, mechanics, lawyers, physicians or divines. It has nothing directly to do with the uses of knowledge. Its business is with minds, and it employs science only as an instrument for the improvement and perfection of mind. With it the habit of sound thinking is more than a thousand thoughts. When, therefore, the question is asked, as it often is asked by ignorance and empiricism, what is the use of certain departments of the College curriculum, the answer should turn, not upon the benefits which in after life may be reaped from these pursuits, but upon their immediate subjective influence upon the cultivation of the human faculties. They are selected in preference to others, because they better train the mind.

THE END OF COLLEGE INSTRUCTION.

It cannot be too earnestly inculcated that knowledge is not the principal end of College instruction, but habits. The acquisition of knowledge is the necessary result of those exercises which terminate in habits, and the maturity of the habit is measured by the degree and accuracy of the knowledge, but still the habits are the main thing. In the next place, it is equally important that the whole course of studies be rigidly exacted of every student. Their value as a discipline depends altogether upon their being studied, and every College is defective in its arrangements which fails to secure, as far as legislation can secure it, this indispensable condition of success. Whatever may be the case in Europe, it is found from experience in this country that nothing will avail without the authority of law. The curriculum must be compulsory, or the majority of the students will neglect it. All must be subjected to catechetical examination in the lecture room, and all must undergo the regular examinations of their class as the condition of their

residence in College. The moment they are exempted from the stringency of this rule all other means lose their power upon the mass of pupils. Much may be accomplished by rewards, and by stimulating the spirit of competition, and great reliance should be placed upon them to secure a high standard of attainment; but in most men the love of ease is stronger than ambition, and indolence a greater luxury than thought. For, whilst mental effort is the one condition of all mental improvement, yet this effort is at first and for a time painful—positively painful in proportion as it is intense, and comparatively painful as it abstracts from other and positively pleasurable activities. It is painful, because its energy is imperfect, difficult, forced. But as the effort is gradually perfected, gradually facilitated, it becomes gradually pleasing; and when finally perfected, that is, when the power is fully developed and the effort changed, into a spontaneity, becomes an exertion absolutely easy. It remains, purely, intensely and alone insatiably pleasurable. For pleasure is nothing but the concomitant or reflex of the unforced and unimpeded energy of a natural faculty or acquired habit, the degree or permanence of pleasure being also in proportion to the intensity and purity of the mental energy. The great postulate in education is, therefore, to induce the pupil to enter and persevere in such a course of effort, good in its result and delectable, but primarily and, in itself, irksome. The argument of necessity helps to reconcile him to the weariness of study; what he feels that he must do he will endeavor to do with grace, and as there is no alternative he will be more open to the generous and manly influence which the rewards and distinctions of the College are suited to exert. There are always causes at work apart from the repulsiveness of intellectual labor to seduce the student from his books; and, before his habits are yet formed and the love of study grounded into his nature, it is of the utmost consequence to keep these causes in check. No other motives will be sufficient without compulsion of law co-operating with this. There are many others which, if they do not positively sweeten his toil, may

help to mitigate the agony of thought. I have insisted upon this point because it is the point in regard to which the most dangerous innovations are to be apprehended.

THE ELECTIVE PLAN.

Two changes have at different times been proposed, one of which would be absolutely fatal and the other seriously detrimental to the interest of the College as a place of liberal education. The first is to convert it into a collection of independent schools, each of which shall be complete in itself, it being left to the choice of the student what schools he shall enter. The other is to remit the obligation of the whole course in reference to a certain class of students, and allow them to pursue such parts of it as they may choose. In relation to the first, young men are incompetent to pronounce beforehand what studies are subjectively the most beneficial. It requires those who have experienced the disciplinary power of different studies to determine their relative value. Only a scholar can say what will make a scholar. The experience of the world has settled down upon a certain class and order of studies, and the verdict of ages and generations is not to be set aside by the caprices, whims or prejudices of those who are not even able to comprehend the main end of education. In the next place, if our undergraduates were competent to form a judgment, their natural love of indolence and ease would, in the majority of cases, lead them to exclude those very studies which are the most improving, precisely because they are so; that is, because, in themselves and in the method of teaching them, they involve a degree and intensity of mental exercise which is positively painful. Self-denial is not natural to man, and he manifests but little acquaintance with human nature who presumes, as a matter of course, that the will will choose what the judgment commends. *Videō meliora proboque deteriora sequor* is more pre-eminently true of the young than the old. They are the creatures of impulse. Permit them to select their own studies and the

majority will select those that are thought to be the easiest. The principle of choice will be the very opposite of that upon which the efficiency of a study depends. Experience is decisive on this point. What creates more trouble in the interior management of our Colleges than the constant desire of pupils to evade recitations? And is it not universally found that the departments which are the most popular are those which least task the energies of the student? I do not say that the Professors who fill these departments are themselves most respected. That will depend upon their merits; and in matters of this sort the judgments of the young are generally right. But easy exercises are preferred, simply because they do not tax the mind. The practical problem with the mass of students is the least work and easiest done. Is it easy? is it short? These are the questions which are first asked about a lesson. I must, therefore, consider any attempt to relax the compulsory feature of the College course as an infallible expedient for degrading education. The College will cease to train. It may be a place for literary triflers, but a place for students it cannot be.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.

There is much in a name, and the change here condemned is delusively sought to be insinuated under the pretext of converting the College into a University. This latter title sounds more imposingly, and carries the appearance of greater dignity. But the truth is, there is hardly a more equivocal word in the language. "In its proper and original meaning," as Sir Wm. Hamilton has satisfactorily shown, "it denotes simply the whole members of a body (generally incorporated body) of persons teaching and learning one or more departments of knowledge." In its ordinary acceptation in this country it is either synonymous with College as an institution of higher education, and in this sense we are already a University; or it denotes a College with professional schools attached. It is clear, how-

ever, that the introduction of the faculties of law, medicine and theology necessitates no change in the faculty of philosophy and arts. It is not necessary to make general education voluntary in order to provide for professional instruction. There is, consequently, nothing in the name or in the nature of the case which demands a fundamental change in the system in order that the South Carolina College may become the South Carolina University. For myself, I am content with our present title, and if it promises less I am sure it will accomplish more than the new title with the corresponding change. As to the expediency of adding the faculties of law and medicine—theology is out of the question to the present organization—I have only to say that it will multiply and complicate the difficulties of the internal management of the institution without securing any increased proficiency in these departments of knowledge; that is, if there is to be any real connection between the faculty of arts and those of law and medicine. I dread the experiment. I think it better that the professions should be left to provide for themselves than that a multitude of inexperienced young men should be brought together, many of whom are comparatively free from the restraints of discipline, and yet have an easy and ready access to those who are more under law. The very liberty of the resident would be a temptation to undergraduates. I have no objection, however, to the founding of professional schools by the State. All that I am anxious for is that they should not be so connected with the College as that the members of all the schools should reside together. To be under a common government is impossible; to be under a different government would breed interminable confusion and disorder. That sort of nominal connection which requires that all medical and law degrees should be conferred by the authorities of the College, and which is perfectly consistent with the law and medical schools, being established in a different place, would, of course, be harmless. But this difficulty might arise: the College would be unwilling to confer any degree without a liberal education—it could not, without

abjuring the very principles of its existence, grant its honors upon mere professional attainment. With respect to the other change, that of allowing students, under certain circumstances, to pursue a partial course, it is evidently contradictory to the fundamental end of the College. These students are not seeking knowledge for the sake of discipline, but with reference to ulterior uses. They come not to be trained to think, but to learn to act in definite departments of exertion. It is professional, not liberal, education which they want. The want, I acknowledge, ought to be gratified—it is a demand which should be supplied—but the College is not the place to do it. That was founded for other purposes, and it is simply preposterous to abrogate its constitution out of concessions to a necessity, because the necessity happens to be real. What, therefore, ought to be done is not to change the nature of the College, but, leaving that untouched to do its own work, to organize schools with special reference to this class of wants. We have the elements of such an organization in the Arsenal and Citadel Academies.

THE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS.

Let these be converted into Seminaries of special education, which will only be an extension of their present plan, and they will form that intermediate class of schools between the elementary and the College, which the circumstances of every civilized community, in proportion to the complication of its interests, demand. These changes in the College have been favored on the ground that they will increase its numbers. But the success of the College is not to be estimated by the numbers in attendance, but by the numbers educated. It should never include more than those who are seeking a liberal education, and if it includes all these, whether they be fifty or two hundred, it is doing the whole of its appropriate work. No doubt, by the changes in question, our catalogue might be increased two or threefold, but we should not educate a single individual more than

we educate now. Numbers in themselves are nothing, unless they represent those who are really devoted to the business of the place. What real advantage would it be to have four or five hundred pupils matriculated here, if some remained only a few months, others remained longer in idleness, and out of the whole number only four or five applied for a degree. That four or five would be the true criterion of success. The real question, I insist, is how many graduate? This is the decisive point. As long as we receive the whole number of young men in the State who are to be liberally educated, whether that number be greater or smaller, we are doing all that we were appointed to do, or that we can be legitimately expected to do; and a decline in numbers is not a necessary proof of the declension of the College; it may be only a proof that the demand is ceasing for higher instruction. The work, however, to be done loses none of its importance in consequence of the failure to appreciate its value; and the remedy is not to give it up and yield to empirical innovations, but to persevere in faith and patience, relying upon time as the great teacher of wisdom.

INDEPENDENCE OF TEACHERS.

Another cardinal principle in the organization of the College is the independence of its teachers. They should be raised above all temptation of catering for popularity, of degrading the standard of education for the sake of the loaves and fishes. They should be prepared to officiate as priests in the temple of learning, in pure vestments, and with hands unstained with a bribe. It has been suggested that if the stipends of the Professors were made dependent upon the number of pupils, the strong motive of personal interest, added to the higher incentives which they are expected to feel, would increase their efficiency by stimulating their zeal and activity. They would be anxious to achieve a reputation for the College which would enable it to command students. This argument proceeds upon a hypothesis which, I am ashamed to say, my own experience pronounces

to be false. In the state of things in this country there is a constant conflict between the government of the College and the candidates for its privileges, the one attempting to raise and the other to lower the standard of admission, and every effort of the faculty in the right direction is met with a determined resistance. It is not to be presumed that young men, at the age of our undergraduates generally, should have any steady and precise notions of the nature of education. A College is a College, and when they are debating the question, whither shall they go, the most important items in the calculation are, not the efficiency, but the cheapness of the place, and the shortness of the time within which a degree may be obtained. The consequence is that no College can resist the current, unless its teachers are independent. In that case they may stand their ground, and, though they can never hope to equal feebleness in numbers, they will still accomplish a great work and confer a lasting benefit on society. The South Carolina College has raised her standard. She has proclaimed her purpose to be to educate well, and I should deplore any measure that might remotely tend to drive her from this position. The true security for the ability of the professional corps is not to be sought in starving them, or in making them scramble for a livelihood, but in the competency, zeal and integrity of the body that appoints them, and in the strict responsibility to which they are held. An impartial board of overseers to elect faithful and turn out incompetent men, a board that has the nerve to do its duty, will be a stronger check upon indolence and inefficiency than an empty larder. The motive of necessity may lead them to degrade instruction to increase their fees; the motive of responsibility to a body that can appreciate their labors will always operate in the right direction. "Let this ground, therefore," says Bacon, "be laid, that all works are overcome by amplitude of reward, by soundness of direction, and by the conjunction of labors. The first multiplieth endeavor, the second preventeth error, and the third supplieth the frailty of man. But the principal of these is direction." So far as the un-

dergraduates are concerned, I think that all these conditions of success are measurably fulfilled in the present arrangements of the College, as much so as the general state of education will allow. No changes in this respect are desirable. But the interests of higher education demands something more than that culture "in passage," as Bacon expresses it, which is all that is contemplated in provisions for undergraduates.

WHERE THE WORK STOPS.

Our work stops with the degree. We have no foundations upon which scholars may be placed, "tending to quietness and privateness of life and discharge of cares and troubles." We are wanting in facilities for "conjunctions" of learned men, and, consequently, the only persons whose business it is to keep pace with the higher intelligence of the age are the few Professors who are employed in the work of instruction. With only such means we must fall behind in the march of improvement. There must be more competition, more leisure, more freedom from distracting cares. "This I take to be," says the great writer from whom I love to quote, "a great cause that hath hindered the profession of learning, because these fundamental knowledges have been studied but in passage; for if you will have a tree bear more fruit than it hath used to do, it is not anything you can do to the boughs, but it is the stirring of the earth and putting new mould about the roots that must work it." I do not look to the Legislature to supply this deficiency. Other demands, more immediate and urgent, must be met, and to meet them adequately will make a heavy draft upon its resources. But I do look to private liberality. Many of the foundations in Oxford and Cambridge have arisen from this source. The Northern Colleges are indebted for the largest part of their funds to the same cause. Why should not some portion of the Southern wealth take the same direction? Are we wanting in the love of knowledge, in the spirit of charity, and in zeal for

the honor and prosperity of the State? I cannot account for the remissness and apathy of our rich planters and merchants and professional men in other way than that this form of generosity has not been the habit of the country. I had hoped that your example and the example of Col. Hampton would have given an impetus to this matter, and I shall not despair until I see the result of the festival which is proposed to be celebrated in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of the College. A body of learned men devoted to the pursuit of fundamental knowledge is what, more than everything else, is now needed to complete our system. There is wealth enough in private coffers and liberality enough in the hearts of our citizens to supply the want, if public interest could only be elicited in the subject. There prevails an impression that the annual appropriations of the Legislature are amply sufficient for all the ends of a College. It is forgotten that these appropriations contemplate it entirely as a place of teaching, and not the residence of scholars. In this latter aspect we are wholly dependent upon private generosity. The advantages to the College, and to the State, and to the whole country, of such a body of resident scholars cannot be estimated. They might in various ways assist in the business of discipline and instruction; they would furnish a constant supply of materials for new Professors; they would give tone and impulse to the aspirations and efforts of the young men gathered around them, and diffuse an influence which, silently and imperceptibly concurring in the formation of that powerful and mysterious combination of separate elements called public opinion, would tell upon every hamlet in the land. "For if men judge that learning should be referred to action, they judge well; but in this they fall into the error described in the ancient fable, in which the other parts of the body did suppose the stomach had been idle, because it neither performed the office of motion, as the limbs do, nor of sense, as the head doth; but yet, notwithstanding it is the stomach that digesteth and distributeth to all the rest; so if any man think philosophy and universality to be idle studies, he doth

not consider that all professions are from thence served and supplied." This homely illustration sets the question of utility in its true light ; and if I could impress upon the community, as it exists in my own mind, the deep and earnest sense of the importance of this feature in the organization of the College, the lack of means would soon cease to be an impediment in keeping pace with the highest culture of the age. It would soon be found that wealth has no more tendency to contract the mind in South Carolina than in Massachusetts and New York, and that there are merchant princes in Charleston as well as in Boston. Who will begin the work? Who shall set the first example of a foundation of ten or twenty thousand dollars, devoted to the support of genius in reflecting light and glory upon the State? It is devoutly to be hoped that something more substantial than echo will answer who.

OBJECTIONS TO THE COLLEGE.

But as there are those who admit, in general, the advantages of a high standard of liberal education, and the consequent importance of such institutions as the College, and yet doubt the wisdom of the policy which directly connects them with the State, a more distinct consideration of this question will not be out of place here. The grounds of doubt are twofold :

First. The College, it is said, is for the benefit of the few, and, therefore, should not be supported by the taxes of the many. What comes from all should be for all ; what is for a class should be by a class.

This is the substance of the clamor by which ignorance and vulgar ambition, and, above all, a pretended regard for the rights and interests of the masses, are constantly endeavoring to steal away the hearts of the people from what, justly considered, is the bulwark of their liberties and the strongest safeguard of their honor and respectability. Hence the cry that the College is an aristocratic institution, a resort for the rich, exclusive of the poor.

The other ground is that education, in its very nature, belongs to the church or to private enterprise; that it includes elements which lie beyond the jurisdiction of the State, and that, therefore, the State has no right to interfere with it. These objections, I think, embody the strength of whatever opposition is expressed or felt to the College as a public foundation. In reference to the first, let it be admitted that the number of those who participate in the privileges of the College is, and must necessarily be, limited. It is, of course, impracticable, even if it were desirable, that every young man in the State should receive a liberal education. Some must be excluded. The very notion of their being excluded implies that they do not share in the immediate advantages of the College. But then the question arises, what is the principle of exclusion, so far as the College is concerned? If that principle is directly based upon difference in fortune, then there is ground of complaint; otherwise, none. Does the College reject any because they are poor? Does it admit any because they are rich? Does it recognize any distinction between rich and poor? Who will venture upon such an allegation? And yet it is only by making wealth the ground of admission, and poverty the ground of exclusion, that the College can be justly charged with aristocratic tendencies. It is notorious that the only question which the College asks as to the qualification for admission to its immunities is in relation to the fitness of the candidates to enter upon its pursuits. All who are prepared to comply with its requisitions are welcomed to its halls, whether rich or poor. Poverty may, indeed, be a remote and accidental cause of exclusion, as it incapacitates for acquiring the fitness which the College exacts, and which is absolutely indispensable to the ends it has in view. But in these cases it is not the poverty which the College considers, but the ignorance and want of preparatory training. There are also expenses incident to a College course which put it out of the power of those who are absolutely without funds to pursue it. A man must be fed and clothed and warmed, and the comforts of life do not

usually come without money; and if he cannot afford the necessary expenses himself, and his friends will not afford them for him, all that can be said is, that Providence has cut him off from a liberal education. He is not in a condition to reap the advantages of personal residence within the College walls.

THE POOR MAN'S COLLEGE.

But the principle of exclusion, so far as the College is concerned, is not a class principle, but one which necessarily results from the nature and end of its institution. It is founded exclusively for a certain kind and degree of education, and it opens its doors to all, without exception, who are prepared for its instructions, and can sustain the expenses necessarily incident to a residence from home. It shuts its doors upon none but upon those who shut them upon themselves, or against whom Providence has closed them. A free College means a College absolutely without expense. We must wait for the realization of such a dream until the manifestation of that state in which our bodies shall cease to be flesh and blood, and such homely articles as food, raiment and fuel be no longer needed. But if an institution is not *ipso facto* aristocratic, because the members of it have to pay for their victuals and clothes, then the South Carolina College is not an aristocratic or class institution. It might not be improper to inquire whether, in those institutions whose glory it is to be, par eminence, institutions for the vulgar, it is pretended that the pupils have absolutely nothing to pay. Can a stark beggar get through them without help? If not, poverty and wealth have the same remote and direct influence in determining who shall participate in their privileges as they have in the South Carolina College. From a somewhat careful inquiry, too, I am inclined to the opinion that none, however poor, ever fail to get through College who have been enabled, either by their own exertions or the assistance of others, to prepare for College. I am sure the number is very small.

Hence, of all charges that the imagination can conceive, that of educating only the rich is the most idle and ridiculous. Most of our students, as a matter of fact, are from families in moderate circumstances, many are absolutely poor, either expending their whole living upon their minds, or toiling in vacations to acquire the means of defraying their expenses, or sustained by the eleemosynary foundations of the College, or by the assistance of the College societies, or by private liberality. The public sentiment of the students speaks volumes upon this point. If there were anything in the genius or organization of the institution which distinguished it as the College of the rich, there would be a corresponding pride of aristocracy among the young men, and the poor would be avoided, insulted or shunned, as a *pro-fanum vulgus*. They would be branded by public opinion as men who were out of their place, as upstarts who were aspiring to the privileges of their betters. This would be necessitated as the common feeling by the organic principle of the body. But what is the truth? I have no hesitation in affirming that if there be a place more than any other where the poor are honored and respected, where indigence, if coupled with any degree of merit, is an infallible passport to favor, that place is the South Carolina College. It may be pre-eminently called the poor man's College in the sense that poverty is no reproach within its walls, no bar to its highest honors and most tempting rewards, either among Professors or students. On the contrary, if there is a prejudice at all it is against the rich; and from long observation and experience I am prepared to affirm that no spirit receives a sterner, stronger, more indignant rebuke within these walls than the pride and vanity of wealth. Let any young man presume upon his fortune and undertake to put on airs, and the whole College pounces down upon him with as little mercy and as much avidity as the jackdaws in the fable upon their aspiring fellow, who was decked in the peacock's feathers. No doubt there are many whose circumstances preclude them from the first steps of a liberal education, and who yet have the capacity to receive it, and

who, if educated, might reflect lasting honor upon the State, but, unfortunately, from the imperfect and inefficient condition of the free schools, these poor children can never be distinguished. One advantage of a more adequate scheme of public instruction will be that of bringing indigent merit to the light. For such cases there ought to be the most ample provision. "This," in the words of Cousin, "is a sacred duty we owe to talent, a duty which must be fulfilled, even at the risk of being sometimes mistaken." The State should either endow scholarships, or extemporize appropriations to meet the cases of those who, when public schools shall have been established, shall be reported as worthy of a liberal education by their earlier teachers. And beyond this, as the same writer observes, it is not desirable that it should provide for the higher instruction of the poor. So much for the limitation of the immediate benefits of the College. They are confined to comparatively a few, simply because it is comparatively a few that are in a condition to receive them.

THE GOOD OF THE STATE AT LARGE.

But then the important point is, and it is a point which ought never to be forgotten, though it is systematically overlooked by those who are accustomed to decry the College, that these benefits are imparted, not for the sake of the few, but for the interest of the many—the good of the State at large. Those who are educated are educated not for themselves, but for the advantage of the Commonwealth as a whole. Every scholar is regarded as a blessing—a great public benefit—and for the sake of the general influence that he is qualified to exert, the State makes provision for his training. It is because the "proper education of youth contributes greatly to the prosperity of society," that it "ought to be an object of legislative attention." The many, therefore, are not taxed for the few, but the few are trained for exalted usefulness and extensive good to the many. If the

Legislature had in view only the interest of those who are educated, and expended its funds in reference to their good, considered simply as individuals, there would be just ground of complaint; but when it is really aiming at the prosperity of the whole community, and uses these individuals as means to that end, there is nothing limited or partial in its measures.

It is great weakness to suppose that nothing can contribute to the general good, the immediate ends of which are not realized in the case of every individual. Are lighthouses constructed only for the safety of the benighted mariner who may be actually guided by their lamps, or are they raised for the security of navigation, the interest of commerce, and, through these, the interest of society at large? There is no way of evading the force of this argument but by flatly denying that an educated class is a public good. If there are any among us who are prepared to take this ground, and to become open advocates of barbarism, I have nothing to say to them; but for the sake of those who may be seduced by sophistry which they cannot disentangle, I offer a few reflections.

THE REAL ELEMENTS OF PROGRESS.

In the first place the educated men in every community are the real elements of steady and consistent progress. They are generally in advance of their generation; light descends from them to their inferiors, and by a gradual and imperceptible influence emanating from the solitary speculations, it may be of their secret hours, the whole texture of society is modified, a wider scope is given to its views and a loftier end to its measures. They are the men who sustain and carry forward the complicated movements of a refined civilization—the real authors of changes which constitute epochs in the social elevation of the race. Pitt could not understand, and Fox refused to read, the masterly speculations of Adam Smith upon the “Wealth of Nations.”

He was ahead of his age. The truth gradually worked its way, however, into the minds of statesmen and legislators, and now no one is held to be fit for any public employment who is not imbued with the principles of political economy. The thoughts of a retired thinker once set in motion, if they have truth in them, have a principle of life which can never be extinguished. They may for a season be repressed and confined, but they finally, like disengaged gases, acquire an intensity and power which defy all opposition. They spread through society, leavening first its leading members, and extending in the shape of results, or maxims, or practical conclusions, to every fireside in the land. The solitary scholar wields a lever which raises the whole mass of society. It is a high, general education which shapes the minds and controls the opinions of the guiding spirits of the age; it is this which keeps up the general tone of society; it is at once conservative and progressive. The conservative tendency requires to be a little more distinctly pointed out.

The case is this: the universal activity which general intelligence imparts to mind must be prolific in schemes and theories, and these are likely to be sound or hurtful, according to the completeness of the instruction or the narrowness of the views on which they are founded. A half truth, or a truth partially apprehended, always has the effect of a lie. A higher order of culture, with occasional exceptions (for profound thinkers are sometimes eccentric), is a security against the ill-digested plans and visionary projects which they are peculiarly tempted to originate, whose vision is confined to a contracted horizon, and who are deceived, simply because they do not perceive the bearing of a principle in all its applications. An educated class expands the field of vision, and serves as a check to the regular impulses and the impetuous innovations of minds equally active but less enlarged. It protects from rashness, from false maxims, from partial knowledge. It is a security for public order which can hardly be over-estimated—it is the regulator of the great clock of society. General intelligence, without

high culture to keep it in check, will exemplify the maxim of Pope—

“A little learning is a dangerous thing”—

and will prove a greater curse to the State than absolute ignorance. It is not ignorance, but half knowledge, that is full of whims and crotchets; they prey on impulse and fanaticism, and are the parent of restless agitation and ceaseless change. It is in the constant play of antagonistic forces, the action and reaction of the higher and lower culture, that the life, health and vigor of society consists. General intelligence checks the stagnation of ignorance, and a thorough education checks the rashness of empiricism. Where this prevails there is all the inspiration without the contortions of the Sibyl.

ELEVATION OF THE MASSES.

In the next place, it should not be omitted that general education is the true source of the elevation of the masses, and of the demand for popular instruction. Every educated man is a centre of light, and his example and influence create the consciousness of ignorance and the sense of need, from which elementary schools have sprung. Defective culture is never conscious of itself until it is brought into contact with superior power. There may be a conviction of ignorance in reference to special things, and a desire of knowledge as the means of accomplishing particular ends; but the need of intellectual improvement on its own account never is awakened spontaneously. We never lament our inferiority to angels. The reason is, we are not brought into contact with them, and are consequently not sensible of the disparity that exists. If we had examples before us of angelic amplitude of mind, the contrast would force upon us a lively impression of the lowness of our intellectual level. If we had never been accustomed to any other light but that of the stars, we should never have dreamed of the sun, nor felt the absence of his rays as any real evil. The

positive in the order of thought is before the privative. We must know the good in order to understand the evil; we must be familiar with the day to comprehend night and darkness. Hence it is that civilization never has been, and never can be, of spontaneous growth among a people. It has always been an inheritance or an importation. If men had been originally created savages they would all have been savages to-day.

Those ingenious theories which undertake, from principles of human nature, to explain the history of man's progress from barbarism to refinement are nothing better than speculative romances. They are contradicted by experience as well as by the laws of the human mind. Philosophy coincides with the Bible—man was created in the image of God, and the rudeness and coarseness of uncivilized communities are states of degradation into which he has apostatized and sunk, and not his primitive and original condition. Civilization has migrated from one centre to another, has found its way among barbarians and savages, and restored them to something of their forfeited inheritance, but in every such instance it has been introduced from without, it has never developed itself from within. Where all is darkness whence is the light to spring? What planet is the source of the rays that shine on it? Hence it is knowledge which creates the demand for knowledge, which causes ignorance to be felt as an evil, and hence it is the education in the first instance of the few which has awakened the strong desire for the illumination of the many. Let knowledge, however, become stagnant, let no provision be made for the constant activity of the highest order of minds in the highest sphere of speculation, and the torpor would be communicated downwards until the whole community was benumbed.

THE PROGRESS OF SOCIETY.

The thinkers in the most abstract departments of speculation keep the whole of society in motion, and upon its motion depends its progress. Scholars, therefore, are the real

benefactors of the people, and he does more for popular education who founds a University than he who institutes a complete and adequate machinery of common schools. The reason is obvious—the most potent element of public opinion is wanting where only a low form of culture obtains. The common schools, having no example of anything higher before them, would soon degenerate and impart only a mechanical culture, if they did not—which I am inclined to think would be the case, from their want of life—permit the people to relapse into barbarism. Colleges, on the other hand, will create the demand for lower culture, and private enterprise under the stimulus imparted would not be backward in providing for it. The College will diffuse the education of principles, of maxims, a tone of thinking and feeling which are of the last importance, without the schools. The schools could never do it without the College. If we must dispense with one or the other, I have no hesitation in saying that on the score of public good alone it were wiser to dispense with the schools. One sun is better than a thousand stars.

There never was, therefore, a more grievous error than that the College is in antagonism to the interests of the people. Precisely the opposite is the truth; and because it is pre-eminently a public good, operating directly or indirectly to the benefit of every citizen in the State, the Legislature was originally justified in founding, and in still sustaining, this noble institution. It has made South Carolina what she is; it has made her people what they are; and from her mountains to her seaboard there is not a nook or corner of the State that has not shared in its healthful influence. The very cries which are coming up from all quarters for the direct instruction of the people, cries which none should think of resisting, are only echoes from the College walls. We should never have heard of them if the state of things had continued among us which existed when the College was founded. The low-country would still have sent its sons to Europe or the North, and the up-country would have been content with its fertile lands and invigorating hills.

EDUCATION LIVES ON CHARITY.

The second ground of objection does not deny or diminish the importance of the College or the general advantages of higher education. It only affirms that the State is not the proper body for dispensing them. The advocates of this negative opinion divide themselves into two classes, one maintaining that Colleges should support themselves, the other that they should be supported by endowments under the control of private or ecclesiastical corporations. The first was the doctrine of Adam Smith, who may be reckoned among the ablest opponents of the policy of public education in the higher branches of learning. He lays down the thesis that the demand will infallibly create the supply, that in science, literature and the arts, as in the commodities which minister to the physical comfort and conveniences of man, what is wanted will be procured. The double operation of private interest, on the one hand to obtain, on the other to furnish, will present inducements enough to originate all the schools that may be needed to teach all the arts that may be desired. This ingenious reasoner forgot that in the matter of education, as Sir Wm. Hamilton justly remarks: "Demand and supply are necessarily co-existent and co-extensive; that it is education which creates the want which education only can satisfy." "Those again," says the same writer, "who, conceding all this, content that the creation and supply of this demand should be abandoned by the State to private intelligence and philanthropy, are contradicted both by reasoning and fact."

The expensiveness of the machinery which is necessary to put in motion a higher Seminary of learning renders it hopelessly impossible to make such institutions self-supporting bodies, and the attempt to do so would have no other effect than to degrade them into professional or scientific schools, in which knowledge is the end and not the instrument. Hence there is not a College University worthy the name, either in Europe or America, that is capable of sustaining, much less of having founded, its various depart-

ments of instruction by the patronage it receives. Education has always lived on charity. Foundations and endowments, partly from individuals, partly from the State, have always been its reliance to supply the apparatus with which the machinery is kept in motion. As to private corporations, it is certain that the degree of interest which is taken in learning for itself will never be adequate to meet the exigencies of higher education. There must be some stronger principle at work, and impulse more general and pervading, in order to touch the chords of private liberality and awaken a responsive thrill. There may be extraordinary efforts of single men, but these spasmodic contributions will be too rare, besides that they may be hampered by unwise restrictions and limitations to answer the ends of a College.

DOES EDUCATION BELONG TO CHURCH OR STATE?

The only principle which has vitality and power enough to keep the stream of private charity steadily turned in the direction of education is the principle of religion. And hence the true and only question is, does education belong to the Church or State? Into the hands of one or the other it must fall, or perish. This, too, is the great practical question among us. To meet formidable war against the College will be that waged on the principle of its existence. I respect the feeling out of which jealousy of State institutions has grown. A godless education is worse than none; and I rejoice that the sentiment is well-nigh universal in this country that a system which excludes the highest and most commanding, the eternal interests of man, must be radically defective, whether reference be had to the culture of the individual or to his prosperity and influence in life. Man is essentially a religious being, and to make no provision for this noblest element of his nature, to ignore and preclude it from any distinct consideration, is to leave him but half educated. The Ancients were accustomed to regard theology as the first philosophy, and there is not a people under the sun whose religion has not been the chief

inspiration of their literature. Take away the influence which this subject has exerted upon the human mind, destroy its contributions to the cause of letters, the impulse it has given to the speculation of philosophy, and what will be left after these subtractions will be comparatively small in quantity and feeble in life and spirit. We must have religion if we would reach the highest forms of education. This is the atmosphere which must surround the mind and permeate all its activities, in order that its development may be free, healthful and vigorous. Science languishes, letters pine, refinement is lost, wherever and whenever the genius of religion is excluded. Experience has demonstrated that, in some form or other, it must enter into every College and pervade every department of instruction. No institution has been able to live without it.

But what right, it is asked, has the State to introduce it? What right, we might ask in return, has the State to exclude it? The difficulty lies in confounding the dogmatic peculiarities of sects with the spirit of religion. The State, as such, knows nothing of sects but to protect them, but it does not follow that the State must be necessarily godless; and so a College knows nothing of denominations, except as a feature in the history of the human race, but it does not follow that a College must be necessarily atheistic or unchristian. What is wanted is the pervading influence of religion as a life, the habitual sense of responsibility to God and of the true worth and destiny of the soul, which shall give tone to the character and regulate all the pursuits of the place. The example, temper and habitual deportment of the teachers, co-operating with the dogmatic instructions which have been received at the fireside and in the church, and coupled with the obligatory observance (except in cases of conscientious scruple) of the peculiar duties of the Lord's day, will be found to do more in maintaining the power of religion than the constant recitation of the catechism or the ceaseless inculcation of sectarian peculiarities. The difficulty of introducing religion is, indeed, rather speculative than practical. When we propose to teach religion as a science

and undertake, by precise boundaries and exact statutory provisions, to define what shall and what shall not be taught, when by written schemes we endeavor to avoid all the peculiarities of sect and opinion without sacrificing the essential interests of religion, the task is impossible. The residuum, after our nice distinctions, is zero.

RELIGIOUS, BUT NOT SECTARIAN.

But why introduce religion as a science? Let it come in the character of the Professors, let it come in the stated worship of the sanctuary, and let it come in the vindication of those immortal records which constitute the basis of our faith. Leave creeds and confessions to the fireside and church, the home and the pulpit. Have Godly teachers and you will have comparatively a Godly College. But what security have we that a State College will pay any attention to the religious character of its teachers? The security of public opinion, which, in proportion as the various religious denominations do their duty in their own spheres, will become absolutely irresistible. Let all the sects combine to support the State College, and they can soon create a sentiment which, with the terrible certainty of fate, shall tolerate nothing unholy or unclean in its walls. They can make it religious without being sectarian. The true power of the church over these institutions is not that of direct control, but of moral influence, arising from her direct work upon the hearts and consciences of all the members of the community.

It is alleged that experience presents us with mournful examples of State institutions degenerating into hotbeds of atheism and impiety. It may be promptly replied that the same experience presents us with equally mournful examples of church institutions degenerating into hotbeds of the vilest heresy and infidelity. And what is more to the point, a sound public opinion has never failed to bring these State institutions back to their proper moorings, while the church institutions have not unfrequently carried their

sects with them and rendered reform impossible. In the case of State institutions, the security for religion lies in the public opinion of the whole community; in the case of church institutions, in the public opinion of a single denomination; and as the smaller body can more easily become corrupt than a larger, as there is a constant play of antagonisms which preserves the health in the one case, while they are wanting in the other, it seems clear that a State College, upon the whole and in the long run, must be safer than any sectarian institution. As long as the people preserve their respect for religion the College can be kept free from danger.

The principle, too, on which the argument for church supervision is founded proves too much. It is assumed that wherever a religious influence becomes a matter of primary importance, there the church has legitimate jurisdiction. "This," it has been well said, "puts an end to society itself, and makes the church the only power that can exist, since all that is necessary is for any officer or any power to be capable of moral effects or influences in order to put it under the dominion of the church. The moral influences of governors, judges, presidents, nay, even sheriffs, coroners or constables, is as real and may be far more extensive than that of school-masters. The moral influence of wealth, manners, taste, is immense; that of domestic habits, nay, even personal habits, often decisive." The truth is, this species of argument would reduce every interest under the sun to the control of the church. It is just the principle on which the authority of the Pope over Kings and States has been assumed and defended. The argument, moreover, is one which can be very easily refuted. If, because education has a religious element it must fall within the jurisdiction of the church, *a fortiori*, because it has multiplied secular elements it must fall within the jurisdiction of the State. The church is a distinct corporation, with distinct rights and authority. She has direct control over nothing that is not spiritual in its matter and connected with our relations to Jesus Christ. She is His kingdom, and her functions are

limited to His work as the Mediator of the covenant and the Saviour of the lost; and if education, in its secular aspects, is not a function of grace, but of nature, if it belongs to man, not as a Christian, but simply as a man, then it no more falls within the jurisdiction of the church than any other secular work. The duties of the State are civil, not sacred; the duties of the church are sacred, not civil. To exclude the church from the control of general education, and to exempt it from the duty of providing the means thereof, it must be shown that education is of the nature of religious things, and that the duty of superintending it is, in its nature, spiritual. Is not a man bound to educate himself as an individual person? Is not every family bound to educate each other, and the head of the family peculiarly bound to educate the members? If so, are these obligations, which arise out of our individual personality and out of our family relations, in any degree at all, or do they spring solely and chiefly out of our obligations as members of Christ? Is a Christian more bound, or is he chiefly bound, or is he exclusively bound—they are three degrees of the same proposition—to acquire and to impart knowledge which has nothing to do with religion, but much to do with temporal success and temporal usefulness, all the positive sciences for example, simply or mainly as a Christian, or because he is a Christian? Or is he bound chiefly, or at all, to do so from any consideration drawn from his individual position, or his relations to his family or his country? These are considerations, and there are many more like them, that require to be deeply pondered before we arrive at the sweeping generalities which assume and assert that denominational education is only the safe and true conclusion of this “high argument.”

SECTARIAN COLLEGES.

Apart from the principle involved, I have other objections to sectarian education. I say sectarian education, for the Church Catholic is one, in the present condition of things,

not visible and corporate. What she does can only be done through the agency of one or more of the various fragments into which she has been suffered to split. In the first place, it is evident, from the feebleness of the sects, that these Colleges cannot be very largely endowed. In the next place, they are likely to be numerous. From these causes will result a strenuous competition for patronage; and from this two effects may be expected to follow: first, the depression of the standard of general education, so as to allure students to their halls; and next, the preference of what is ostentatious and attractive in education to what is solid and substantial. It is true that there can be no lofty flight, as Bacon has suggested, "without some feathers of ostentation;" but it is equally true there can be no flight at all where there are not bone, muscle and sinew to sustain the feathers. It is also a serious evil that the State should be habitually denounced as profane and infidel. To think and speak of it in that light is the sure way to make it so; and yet this is the uniform representation of the advocates of church education. They will not permit the State to touch the subject, because its fingers are unclean. Can there be a more certain method to uproot the sentiment of patriotism, and to make us feel that the Government of the country is an enormous evil, to which we are to submit, not out of love, but for conscience sake? Will not something like this be the inevitable effect of the declamation and invective which bigots and zealots feel authorized to vent against the Commonwealth that protects them, in order that they may succeed in their narrow schemes? Instead of clinging around the State as they would cling to the bosom of a beloved parent, and concentrating upon her the highest and holiest influences which they are capable of exerting; instead of teaching their children to love her as the ordinance of God for good, to bless her for her manifold benefits, and to obey her with even a religious veneration, they repel her to a cold and cheerless distance, and brand her with the stigma of Divine reprobation. The result must be bad. The fanaticism which despises the State, and the infidelity

which contemns the church, are both alike the product of ignorance and folly. God has established both the church and the State. It is as clearly our duty to be loyal and enlightened citizens as to be faithful and earnest Christians.

A BOND OF UNION.

I think, too, that the tendency of sectarian Colleges to perpetuate the strife of sects, to fix whatever is heterogeneous in the elements of national character, and to alienate the citizens from each other, is a consideration not to be overlooked. There ought surely to be some common ground on which the members of the same State may meet together and feel that they are brothers—some common ground on which their children may mingle without confusion or discord, and bury every narrow and selfish interest in the sublime sentiment that they belong to the same family. Nothing is so powerful as a common education, and the thousand sweet associations, which spring from it and cluster around it, to cherish the holy brotherhood of men. Those who have walked together in the same paths of science, and taken sweet counsel in the same halls of learning; who went arm in arm in that hallowed season of life when the foundations of all excellence are laid; who have wept with the same sorrows or laughed at the same joys; who have been fired with the same ambition; lured with the same hopes, and grieved at the same disappointments—these are not the men, in after years, to stir up animosities or foment intestine feuds. Their college life is a bond of union which nothing can break—a divine poetry of existence which nothing is allowed to profane. Who can forget his college days and his college companions, and even his college dreams? Would you make any Commonwealth a unit, educate its sons together? This is the secret of the harmony which has so remarkably characterized our State. It was not the influence of a single mind, great as that mind was—it was no tame submission to authoritative dictation. It was the community of thought, feeling and character,

achieved by a common education within these walls. Here it was that heart was knit to heart, mind to mind, and that a common character was formed. All these advantages must be lost if the sectarian scheme prevails. South Carolina will no longer be a unit, nor her citizens brothers. We shall have sect against sect, school against school, and College against College; and he knows but little of the past who has not observed that the most formidable dangers to any State are those which spring from divisions in its own bosom, and that these divisions are terrible in proportion to the degree in which the religious element enters into them.

I shall say no more upon the College. I have spoken of its end, its organization and its defects, and have vindicated the policy upon which it was founded. What I have said I believe to be true, and I am sure that it is seasonable; and nothing would delight me more, as a man, a Christian and a patriot, than to see all jealousies laid aside, all sectarian schemes abandoned, and the whole State, as one man, rally to its support. It would find ample employment for all the funds which private liberality is pouring into the coffers of other institutions; and when charity had done its utmost, and the Government still more freely unlocked its treasury, we should have a splendid institution beyond doubt, but one which was still not perfect. Education is a vast and complicated interest, and it requires the legacies of ages and generations past, as well as the steady contributions of the living, to keep the stream from subsiding. Let it roll among us like a mighty river, whose ceaseless flow is maintained by the springs of charity and the great fountain of public munificence. Let us have a College which is worthy of the name—to which we can invite the scholars of Europe with an honest pride, and to which our children may repair from all our borders, as the States of Greece to their Olympia, or the chosen tribes to Mount Zion. How beautiful it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!

THE FREE SCHOOLS.

II. The next part of our system, in the order of legislation, is the free schools. And here I am sorry to say that

the law is not only inadequate, but there is a very extraordinary discrepancy between the law and the practice, which increases the difficulty and has added to the inefficiency of the standing appropriation. It is clear from the face of it that the Act of 1811 was designed as the first step towards the establishment of a system of common schools that should bring the means of elementary education within the reach of every child in the State. It was not intended to be a provision for *paupers*. Throughout our statutes free schools mean public schools, or schools which are open to every citizen. The first Act in which I find the expression is that of the 8th of April, 1710, entitled "An Act for the founding and erecting of a free school for the use of the inhabitants of South Carolina." This Act created and incorporated a Board of Trustees for the purpose of taking charge of such funds as had already been contributed, or might afterwards be contributed, for public instruction in the Province. In it the epithet *free* is synonymous, not with *pauper*, but *public*, or *common*. The same is the case in the Act of the 7th of June, 1712, entitled "An Act for the encouragement of learning." Although the school was a *free* school, every pupil was required to *pay* for his tuition. But the meaning of the phrase is made still clearer by the extended Act of the 12th December of the same year. There the school was manifestly open to all. Special inducements were held out to patronize and encourage it, and provisions made for educating a certain number free of expense. The Act of 1811, which is the basis of our present system, is so clear and explicit as to the kind of schools to be founded, that I am utterly unable to account for the partial and exclusive interpretation which has been put upon its words. The Third Section provided "that every citizen of this State shall be entitled to send his or her child or children, ward or wards, to any free school in the district where he or she may reside, free from any expense whatever on account of tuition; and where more children shall apply for admission at any one school than can be conveniently educated therein, a preference shall always be given to poor orphans and children of indigent and necessitous parents."

I have no doubt that, if this Act had been executed according to its true intent and meaning, and public schools had been established in every district of the State corresponding to the number of members in the House of Representatives, the advantages would have been so conspicuous that the Legislature could not have stopped until the means of instruction had been afforded to every neighborhood, to every family, and to every child. The law was wise; it was strictly tentative and provisional, but its benevolent intention has been defeated by a singular misconception of its meaning. As a provisional law, it was defective in unity of plan. The Commissioners in each district were absolutely independent and irresponsible. There was no central power which could correct mistakes, and which could infuse a common spirit and a common life into the whole scheme. The consequence is that, after all our legislation and all our expenditures, we have not even the elements in practical operation of a system of public schools. We have the whole work to begin anew.

You will permit me to suggest a few reasons why we should begin it heartily and at once, and then to imitate the nature and extent of our incipient efforts :

In the first place, it is the duty of the State to provide for the education of its citizens. Even Adam Smith, who, we have seen, was opposed to the direct interference of the Government in higher, or liberal education, is constrained to admit that the education of the common people forms an exception to his principle. He makes it the care of the Government, upon the same general ground with the cultivation of a martial spirit. We should be as solicitous that our citizens should not be ignorant as that they should not be cowards. The whole passage is so striking that you will excuse me for quoting it in full :

THE DUTY OF THE STATE.

“ But a coward, or a man incapable either of defending or revenging himself, evidently wants one of the most essential parts of the character of a man. He is as much muti-

lated and deformed in his mind as another is in his body, who is either deprived of some of his most essential members, or has lost the use of them. He is evidently the more wretched and miserable of the two, because happiness and misery, which reside altogether in the mind, must necessarily depend more upon the healthful or unhealthful, the mutilated or entire state of the mind, than upon that of the body. Even though the martial spirit of the people were of no use towards the defence of the society, yet to prevent that sort of mental mutilation, deformity and wretchedness, which cowardice necessarily involves in it, from spreading themselves through the great body of the people, would still deserve the most serious attention of Government—in the same manner as it would deserve its most serious attention to prevent a leprosy, or any other loathsome and offensive disease, from spreading itself among them; though, perhaps, no other public good might result from such attention besides the prevention of so great a public evil.

“The same thing may be said of the gross ignorance and stupidity which, in a civilized society, seems so frequently to benumb the understanding of all the inferior ranks of people. A man without the proper use of the intellectual faculties of a man is, if possible, more contemptible than even a coward, and seems to be mutilated and deformed in a still more essential part of the character of human nature. Though the State was to derive no advantage from the instruction of the inferior ranks of the people, it would still deserve its attention that they should not be altogether uninstructed. The State, however, derives no considerable advantages from their instruction. The more they are instructed the less liable they are to the delusions of enthusiasm and superstition, which, among ignorant nations, frequently occasion the most dreadful disorders. An instructed and intelligent people, besides, are always more decent and orderly than an ignorant and stupid one. They feel themselves, each individually, more respectable, and more likely to obtain the respect of their lawful superiors,

and they are, therefore, more disposed to respect those superiors. They are more disposed to examine, and more capable of seeing through, the interested complaints of faction and sedition; and they are, upon that account, less apt to be misled into any wanton or unnecessary opposition to the measures of Government. In free countries, where the safety of Government depends very much upon the favorable judgment which the people may form of its conduct, it must surely be of the highest importance that they should not be disposed to judge rashly or capriciously concerning it."

"If the community wish to have the benefit of more knowledge and intelligence in the laboring classes," says Say, "it must dispense it at the public charge. This object may be obtained by the establishment of primary schools, of reading, writing and arithmetic. These are the groundwork of all knowledge, and are quite sufficient for the civilization of the lower classes. In fact, one cannot call a native civilized, nor consequently possessed of the benefits of civilization, until the people at large be instructed in these three particulars; till then it will be but partially reclaimed from barbarism."

I might multiply authorities to an indefinite extent, showing that it is the general opinion of political philosophers that popular instruction is one of the most sacred duties of the Commonwealth. The opinion obviously rests upon two grounds—the importance of education in itself and in its relation to the State, and the impossibility of adequately providing for it without the assistance of the Legislature. The alternative is either that the education of the people must be abandoned as hopeless, or the Government must embark in the work. Surely, if this be really the state of the case, South Carolina cannot hesitate a moment as to which branch of the proposition she will choose.

THE FOLLY OF INDIVIDUAL EFFORT.

When it is remembered that education makes the citizen as well as the man—that it is precisely what fits a human

being to be a living member of a Commonwealth—we cannot hesitate as to whether our people shall be ciphers or men. And that this is the alternative is clear, both from the nature of the case and from fact. Whoever considers what it is to provide an adequate system of instruction for all the children of a country, the amount of funds necessary to erect school-houses, to found libraries, to procure the needful apparatus, to pay teachers, and to keep the machinery, once set in motion, in steady and successful operation, will perceive the folly of entrusting such a task to the disjointed efforts of individuals, or the conflicting efforts of religious denominations. In either case there will be no unity of plan, no competency of means; what is done must be done partially, and, because partially, must be done amiss.

“All experience,” says Sir Wm. Hamilton, “demonstrates the necessity of State interference. No countries present a more remarkable contrast in this respect (in regard to popular education) than England and Germany. In the former the State has done nothing for the education of the people, and private benevolence more than has been attempted elsewhere; in the latter, the Government has done everything, and left to private benevolence almost nothing to effect. The English people are, however, the lowest, the German people the highest, in the scale of knowledge. All that Scotland enjoys of popular education above the other kingdoms of the British Empire she owes to the State, and among the principalities of Germany, from Russia down to Hesse Cassel, education is uniformly found to prosper exactly in proportion to the extent of interference and to the unremitting watchfulness of the Government. The experience of the last half century in Germany has, indeed, completely set at rest the question. For thirty years no German has been found to maintain the doctrine of Smith. In their generous rivalry the Governments of that country have practically shown what a benevolent and prudent policy could effect for the University as well as for the school, and, knowing what they have done, who is there now

to maintain that for education, as for trade, the State can prevent evil, but cannot originate good?"

There are those among us who admit that no complete system of popular education can be instituted without the intervention of the State, and yet maintain that the true method of intervention is simply to supplement individual exertions; that is, they would have those who are able to do so educate their children in schools sustained by themselves, and solicit the aid of the Legislature only for paupers. It is obvious, in the first place, that in this there is no system at all; the schools are detached and independent, they have no common life, and the State knows nothing of the influences which may be exerted within them. Education is too complicated an interest, and touches the prosperity of the Commonwealth in too many points, to be left, in reference to the most important class of its subjects, absolutely without responsibility to the Government. The homogeneousness of the population can only be sustained by a general system of public schools.

In the next place, the scheme is invidious—it makes a reproachful distinction betwixt the children of the Commonwealth, and in the last place it must, from this very circumstance, be inefficient. Parents will scorn a favor rather than permit their children to be stigmatized as the condition of receiving it. The true policy of the State is to recognize no distinction betwixt the rich and the poor; to put them all upon the same footing; to treat them all upon the same footing; to treat them simply as so many minds whose capacities are to be unfolded and whose energies are to be directed. The rich and the poor in the school-house, as in the house of God, should meet together upon the ground of their common relations, and the consequences of this promiscuous elementary training would soon be felt in harmonizing and smoothing all the unevenness, harshness and inequalities of social life.

In the second place, the State should make some speedy provision for popular education in consequence of the unusual demand which, in some form or other, is indicated as existing in every section of the country.

THE DEMAND FOR SCHOOLS.

There never was a greater cry for schools ; the people are beginning to appreciate their importance, and at no period within my recollection have such strenuous efforts been made to establish and support them. The extraordinary exertions of the various sects—exertions, too, which deserve all praise when considered as attempts to satisfy an acknowledged public want, and the success which has attended them—are proofs that public opinion is ripe in South Carolina for the interference of the Legislature ; and if it should not speedily interfere this great and mighty interest will pass completely out of its hands and be beyond its regulation or control. It is a critical period with us in the history of education. The people are calling for schools and teachers, and if the State will not listen to their cries they will be justified in adopting the best expedients they can, and in acceding to the provisions which religious zeal proposes to their acceptance. Our people are not, as a body, in favor of sectarian education. They prefer a general and inclusive system, and if they adopt the narrower one it will be because their own Government has been inattentive to their interests. I sincerely hope that the Legislature may be duly sensible of the delicate posture of this subject. To my mind it is clear as the noonday sun that, if anything is to be done, it must be done at once. Now or never is the real state of the problem.

In the third place, the State should take the subject in hand, because this is the only way by which consistency and coherence can be secured in the different departments of instruction. Education is a connected work, and its various subdivisions should be so arranged that, while each is a whole in itself, it should be at the same time a part of a still greater whole. The lower elementary education should, for example, be complete for those who aspire to nothing more ; it should likewise be naturally introductory to a higher culture. It should be a perfect whole for the one class, and a properly adjusted part for the other. So, also,

the higher elementary education, that of the grammar school, should be complete for those who are not looking to liberal education, and yet, in relation to others, subsidiary to the College or the scientific schools. This unity in the midst of variety cannot be secured without a common centre of impulse and of action. There must be one presiding spirit, one head, one heart. Education will become a disjointed and fragmentary process if it is left to individuals, to private corporations and religious sects. Each will have his tongue and his psalm, and we shall have as many crotchets and experiments as there are controlling bodies. The competition excited will be a competition not for efficiency in instruction, but for numbers; each will estimate success by the hosts that can be paraded at its annual festivals, or the pomp and pretension of a theatrical pageant, played off under the name of an examination. This is not the language of reproach; it is a result which, from the principles of human nature, will be inevitably necessitated by the condition in which they shall find themselves placed.

Let me add, in this place, that public education is recommended by considerations of economy. Absolutely it is the cheapest of all systems. It saves the enormous expense of boarding schools, or the still heavier expense of domestic tutors, one of which must be encountered when it is left to private enterprise to supply the means of education. If the amount which is annually expended in South Carolina upon the instruction of that portion of her children who are looking to a liberal education could be collected into one sum, we would be amazed at the prodigality of means in comparison with the poverty of the result. The same sum judiciously distributed would go very far towards supplying every neighborhood with a competent teacher. From the want of system there is no security that, with all this lavish expenditure, efficient instructors shall be procured. Those who employ the teachers are not always competent to judge of their qualifications, and the consequence is that time and money are both not infrequently squandered in learning what has afterwards to be unlearned. The danger, too, of

sending children from home at an early age, the evil of exemption from parental influence and discipline, are not to be lightly hazarded. The State should see to it that the family is preserved in its integrity, and enabled to exert all its mighty power in shaping the character of the future citizens of the Commonwealth. Comparatively, public education is cheap, as general intelligence contributes to general virtue, and general virtue diminishes expenditures for crimes; it is cheap, as it develops the resources of the country and increases the mass of its wealth. It is not labor, but intelligence that creates new values; and public education is an outlay of capital that returns to the coffers of the State with an enormous interest. Not a dollar, therefore, that is judiciously appropriated to the instruction of the people will ever be lost. The five talents will gain other five, and the two talents other two; while to neglect this great department of duty is to wrap the talent in a napkin and bury it in the bowels of the earth.

THE REAL DIFFICULTY.

But, after all, the practical question is one of real difficulty. What shall the State do? This is a point of great delicacy, and demands consummate wisdom. Nothing should be done abruptly and violently, no measures should be adopted that are not likely to recommend themselves, no attempt made to force an acquiescence into any provisions, however salutary they may have proved elsewhere, which are not founded in the habits and predilections of the people, or obviously indispensable to elevate and improve them. The public mind should be prepared for every great movement before it is begun. Popular enthusiasm should, if possible, be awakened by addresses and disputations, which, like pioneers, prepare the way for the law by making rough places plain and the crooked straight. Above all, we should guard against attempting to make our system too perfect at the outset. The words of Cousin are as applicable to us now as they were to France at the time

he wrote them: "God grant that we may be wise enough to see that any law on primary instruction passed now must be a provisional and not a definite law; that it must of necessity be reconstructed at the end of ten years, and that the only thing now is to supply the most urgent wants, and to give legal sanction to some incontestable points." *Festina lente* contains a caution which it becomes States as well as individuals to respect.

What we first need is a collection of the facts from which the data of a proper system may be drawn. We must know the number of children in the State of the ages at which children are usually sent to school, the kind and degree of education demanded, the relative distances of the residence of parents, the points at which school-houses may be most conveniently erected, the number of buildings required, the number of teachers, and the salaries which different localities make necessary to a competent support. Facts of this sort must constitute the ground-work. In possession of these we may then proceed to compare different systems, adopting from among them that which seems to be best adapted to our own circumstances, or originate a new one if all should prove unsatisfactory.

All, therefore, that in my judgment the Legislature should undertake at present is to acquire this preliminary information, including the accumulation of facts, the comparison of different common school systems, and the digest of a plan suited to the wants of our own people. This can be done by the appointment of a minister of public instruction, who shall be regarded as an officer of the Government, compensated by a large salary, and who shall give himself unreservedly to this great interest. Let him be required to traverse the State, to inspect the condition of every neighborhood, and from personal observation and authentic testimony let him become acquainted with the number, the extent and the circumstances of the children. Let him be prepared to say where school-houses can be most conveniently erected, the distance at which they should be removed from each other, the kind of teacher needed in each

neighborhood, and let him indicate what sections of the State are unprepared for schools in consequence of the dispersion of their inhabitants. Let him be able to give some probable estimate of the expenses incident to the successful operation of an adequate scheme. In the next place, it should be his duty to master the existing systems, whether in this country or Europe, and to lay before the Legislature a succinct account of their fundamental provisions. Let him propose the scheme which he thinks ought to be adopted here, and let his report be referred to an able and learned commissioner, charged with the final preparation of such a scheme as we may be ready to enact into law.

I shall not disguise from your Excellency that upon many points connected with details of any and every scheme my own opinion has long ago been definitely settled. The extent or degree of elementary education, the best mode of securing competent teachers, the principle which should regulate their salaries, the introduction of religion into the schools—these and many other similar topics I have investigated to my own satisfaction. But, in the present condition of the whole subject, it would be obviously premature to express the opinions of any individual. The minister of public instruction should have the whole subject before him, and whatever discussions may take place upon details should be consequent upon and not prior to this report. All, therefore, that I would now press upon your Excellency is to have public instruction erected into a department of the Government. That is the first and indispensable step, and until that is done there never can be a plan adequate, consistent, successful. I have only to add here that this is substantially the recommendation which I had the honor to make in concert with the Bishop of Georgia some fourteen or fifteen years ago, and time and observation have only strengthened my convictions of the wisdom and necessity of the measure.

MILITARY SCHOOLS.

III. The third and last part of our system is the military schools. What I have to suggest in regard to them is that

they be made to supply a want which is constantly increasing, as the country advances in trade and the arts. It is a great evil that there should be nothing intermediate between the grammar school and the College, and that all who wish to acquire nothing more than the principles of physical science, on account of their application to various branches of industry, should be compelled to purchase this privilege by bearing, what to them is, the heavy burden of liberal education. They do not want Latin, Greek and philosophy, and it is hard that they cannot be permitted to get a little chemistry, a little engineering, or a little natural philosophy, without going through Homer and Virgil, Aristotle and Locke. "Two great evils" (I use the words of Cousin, who is deploring a similar state of things in France), "two great evils are the consequence. In general, these boys, who know that they are not destined to any very distinguished career, go through their studies in a negligent manner; they never get beyond mediocrity, when, at about eighteen, they go back to the habits and the business of their fathers. As there is nothing in their ordinary life to recall or to keep up their studies, a few years obliterate every trace of the little classical learning they acquired. On the other hand, these young men often contract tastes and acquaintances at College which render it difficult, nay almost impossible, for them to return to the humble way of life to which they are born; hence a race of men restless, discontented with their position, with others and with themselves; enemies of a state of society in which they feel themselves out of place, and with some acquirements, some real or imagined talent, and unbridled ambition, are ready to rush into any career of servility or revolt. Our Colleges ought, without doubt, to remain open to all who can pay the expenses of them, but we ought by no means to force the lower classes into them; yet this is the inevitable effect of having no intermediate establishment between the primary schools and Colleges."

The remedy, as I have already shown, is not to change the construction of the College, but to employ the elements

which we confessedly have, and which are essentially suited to the purpose.

I shall trespass upon the patience of your Excellency no longer. In all that I have said I have had an eye to the prosperity and glory of my native State. Small in territory and feeble in numbers, the only means by which she can maintain her dignity and importance is by the patronage of letters. A mere speck compared with several other States in the Union, her reliance for the protection of her rights and her full and equal influence in Federal legislation must be upon the genius of her statesmen and the character of her people. Let her give herself to the rearing of a noble race of men, and she will make up in moral power what she wants in votes. Public education is the cheap expedient for uniting us among ourselves, and rendering us terrible abroad. Mind after all must be felt, and I am anxious to see my beloved Carolina pre-eminently distinguished for the learning, eloquence and patriotism of her sons. Let us endeavor to make her in general intelligence what she is in dignity and independence of character—the brightest star in the American constellation. God grant that the time may soon come when not an individual born within our borders shall be permitted to reach maturity without having mastered the elements of knowledge.

I am, with considerations of the highest respect,

J. H. THORNWELL.







THIS edition in pamphlet form has been published by some friends of education for free circulation. To promote which end copies have been furnished to the gentlemen named below for distribution and delivery within their several Counties:

WM. HENRY PARKER.....	Abbeville.
JAMES ALDRICH.....	Aiken.
B. F. WHITNER.....	Anderson.
ISAAC M. HUTSON.....	Barnwell.
WM. ELLIOTT.....	Beaufort.
CHARLES BOYLE.....	Berkeley.
WM. A. COURTENAY	Charleston.
J. J. McLURE.....	Chester.
JAS. C. COIT	Chesterfield.
J. F. RHAME.....	Clarendon.
J. D. EDWARDS.....	Colleton.
E. KEITH DARGAN.....	Darlington.
D. A. G. OUZTS.....	Edgefield.
J. H. RION.....	Fairfield.
WALTER HAZARD.	Georgetown.
ISAAC M. BRYAN.	Greenville.
C. J. C. HUTSON....	Hampton.
T. M. GILLESPIE.....	Horry.
W. L. LEITNER'....	Kershaw.
J. D. WYLIE	Lancaster.
H. Y. SIMPSON.....	Laurens.
H. A. MEETZE.....	Lexington.
JOSEPH T. WALSH.....	Marion.
KNOX LIVINGSTONE.....	Marlboro'.
GEORGE JOHNSTONE.....	Newberry.
JOHN S. VERNER.....	Oconee.
JAS. F. IZLAR.....	Orangeburg.
J. E. BOGGS.....	Pickens.
J. M. McBRIDE.....	Richland.
THOS. J. MOORE	Spartanburg.
J. D. BLANDING.....	Sumter.
J. G. McKISSICK.....	Union.
T. M. GILLAND	V
W. B. WILSON.....	

